

Authentic Report of Twelve Talks given by

Krishnamurti

COPYRIGHT: • PUBLISHED BY
Krishnamurti Writings Inc.
Ojai, California, U.S.A.

OJAI CAMP—1934

Issued By
THE STAR PUBLISHING-TRUST
2123 North Beachwood Drive, Hollywood, California
Crown House, 147 Regent St., London W.1, England
Vasanta Vihar, Adyar, Madras, India
Ommeu (O), Holland

All Rights Reserved
Printed in the United States of America

It is my purpose ~~not~~ to do that I am going to make
of thought, as to awaken ~~not~~ so much to give a system
certain statements, naturally ~~atic~~, which I hope you will con-
sider, and as you consider them, there will arise many questions; if
you will kindly put these to me, I will try to answer them, and thus
we can discuss further what I have to say.

I wonder why most of you come here? Presumably you are seeking something. And what are you seeking? You cannot answer that question, naturally, because your search varies, the object of your search varies; the object of your search is constantly changing, so you do not definitely know what you seek, what you want. But you have established unfortunately a habit of going from one supposed spiritual teacher to another supposed spiritual teacher, of joining various organizations, societies, and of following systems; in other words, trying to find out what gives you greater and greater satisfaction, excitement.

This process of going from one school of thought to another, from one system of thought to another, from one teacher to another, you call the search for truth. In other words, you are going from one idea to another idea, from one system of thought to another, accumulating, hoping to understand life, trying to fathom its significance, its struggles, each time declaring that you have found something.

Now, I hope you won't say at the end of my talks that you have found something, because the moment you have found something you are already lost; it is an anchor to which mind clings, and therefore that eternal movement, this true search of which I am going to speak, ceases. And most minds are looking for a definite aim, with this definite desire to find, and when once there is established this desire, you will find something. But it won't be something living, it will be a dead thing that you will find, and therefore you will put that away to turn to another; and this process of continually choosing, continually discarding, you call acquiring wisdom, experience, or truth.

Probably most of you have come here with this attitude, consciously or unconsciously, so your thought is expended merely on the search for schemes and confirmations, on the desire to join a movement or form groups, without the clarity of the fundamental or trying to understand what these fundamental things of life mean. So as I said, I am not putting forward an ideal to be imitated, a goal to be found, but my

purpose is rather to awaken the mind which the mind can liberate itself from these things which we have established, which we have taken for granted as being true.

Now, each one tries to immortalize the product of environment; that thing which is the result of the environment, but we try to make eternal. That is, the various fears, hopes, opinions, prejudices, likes, personal views which we glorify as our temperament—these are, after all, the result, the product of environment; and the bundle of these memories, which is the result of environment, the product of the reactions to environment, this bundle becomes that consciousness which we call the "I". Is that not so? The whole struggle is between the result of environment with which mind identifies itself and becomes the "I", between that, and environment. After all, the "I", the consciousness with which the mind identifies itself, is the result of environment. The struggle takes place between that "I" and the constantly changing environment.

You are continually seeking immortality for this "I". In other words, falsehood tries to become the real, the eternal. When you understand the significance of the environment, there is no reaction and therefore there is no conflict between the reaction, that is, between what we call the "I" and the creator of the reaction which is the environment. So this seeking for immortality, this craving to be certain, to be lasting, is called the process of evolution, the process of acquiring truth or God or the understanding of life. And anyone who helps you towards this, who helps you to immortalize reaction which we call the "I", you make of him your redeemer, your saviour, your master, your teacher, and you follow his system. You follow him with thought, or without thought; with thought when you think that you are following him with intelligence because he is going to lead you to immortality, to the realization of that ecstasy. That is, you want another to immortalize for you that reaction which is the outcome of environment, which is in itself inherently false. Out of the desire to immortalize that which is false you create religions, sociological systems and divisions, political methods, economic panaceas, and moral standards. So gradually in this process of developing systems to make the individual immortal, lasting, secure, the individual is completely lost, and he comes into conflict with the creations of his own search, with the creations which are born out of his longing to be secure and which he calls immortality.

After all, why should religions exist? Religions as divisions of thought have grown, have been glorified and nourished by sets of beliefs because there is this desire that you shall realize, that you shall attain, that there shall be immortality.

And again, moral standards are merely the creations of society, so

individual may be in bondage. To me, morality cannot be standardized. There cannot be at the same time morality and standards. There can only be intelligence, which is not, which cannot be standardized. But we shall go into that in my later talks.

So this continual search in which each one of us is caught up, the search for happiness, for truth, for reality, for health—this continual desire is cultivated by each one of us in order that we may be secure, permanent. And out of that search for permanency, there must be conflict, conflict between the result of environment, that is the "I", and the environment itself.

Now if you come to think of it, what is the "I"? When you talk about "I", "mine", my house, my enjoyment, my wife, my child, my love, my temperament, what is that? It is nothing but the result of environment, and there is a conflict between that result, the "I", and the environment itself. Conflict can only and must inevitably exist between the false and the false, not between truth and the false. Isn't that so? There cannot be conflict between what is true and what is false. But there can be conflict and there must be conflict between two false things, between the degrees of falseness, between the opposites.

So do not think this struggle between the self and the environment, which you call the true struggle, is true. Isn't there a struggle taking place in each one of you between yourself and your environment, your surroundings, your husband, your wife, your child, your neighbour, your society, your political organizations? Is there not a constant battle going on? You consider that battle necessary in order to help you to realize happiness, truth, immortality, or ecstasy. To put it differently: what you consider to be the truth is but self-consciousness, the "I", which is all the time trying to become immortal, and the environment which I say is the continual movement of the false. This movement of the false becomes your ever changing environment, which is called progress, evolution. So to me, happiness, or truth, or God, cannot be found as the outcome of the result of environment, the "I", the continually changing conditions.

I will try to put it again, differently. There is conflict, of which each one of you is conscious, between yourself and the environment, the conditions. Now, you say to yourself: "If I can conquer environment, overcome it, dominate it, I shall find out, I shall understand"; so there is this continual battle going on between yourself and environment.

Now what is the "yourself"? It is but the result, the product of environment. So what are you doing? You are fighting one false thing with another false thing, and environment will be false so long

as you do not understand it. Therefore the environment is that consciousness which you call the "I", which is continually trying to become immortal. And to make it immortal there must be many ways, there must be means, and therefore you have religions, systems, philosophies, all the nuisances and barriers that you have created. Hence there must be conflict between the result of environment and environment itself; and, as I said, there can be conflict only between the false and the false; never between truth and the false. Whereas, in your minds there is this firmly established idea that in this struggle between the result of environment, which is the "I", and the environment itself, lies power, wisdom, the path to eternity, to reality, truth, happiness.

Our vital concern should be with this environment, not with the conflict, not how to overcome it, not how to run away from it. By questioning the environment and trying to understand its significance, we shall find out its true worth. Isn't that so? Most of us are enmeshed, caught up in the process of trying to overcome, to run away from circumstances, environment; we are not trying to find out what it means, what is its cause, its significance, its value. When you see the significance of environment, it means drastic action, a tremendous upheaval in your life, a complete, revolutionary change of ideas, in which there is no authority, no imitation. But very few are willing to see the significance of environment, because it means change, a radical change, a revolutionary change, and very few people want that. So most people, vast numbers of people, are concerned with the evasion of environment; they cover it up, or try to find new substitutions by getting rid of Jesus Christ and setting up a new saviour: by seeking new teachers in place of the old, but they do not ever inquire whether they need a guide at all. This alone would help, this alone would give the true significance of that particular demand.

So where there is a search for substitution, there must be authority, the following of leadership, and hence the individual becomes but a cog in the social and religious machinery of life. If you look closely you will see that your search is nothing but a search for comfort and security and escape; not a search for understanding, not a search for truth, but rather a search for an evasion and therefore a search for the conquering of all obstacles; after all, all conquering is but substitution, and in substitution there is no understanding.

There are escapes through religions, with their edicts, moral standards, fears, authorities; and escapes through self-expression—what you call self-expression, what the vast majority of people call self-expression, is but the reaction against environment, is but the effort to express oneself through reaction against that environment—self-expression

through art, through science, through various forms of action. Here I am not including the true, spontaneous expressions of beauty, of art, of science; they in themselves are complete. I am talking of the man who is seeking these things as a means of self-expression. A real artist does not talk about his self-expression, he is expressing that which he intensely feels; but there are so many spurious artists, like the spurious spiritual people, who are all the time seeking self-expression as a means of getting something, some satisfaction which they cannot find in the environment in which they live.

Through this search for security and permanency, we have established religions with all their inanities, divisions, exploitations, as means of escape; and these means of escape become so vital, so important, because, to tackle environment, that is, the conditions about us, demands tremendous action, voluntary, dynamic action, and very few are willing to take that action. On the contrary, you are willing to be forced to an action by environment, by circumstances; that is, if a man becomes highly moral and virtuous through depression, you say what a nice man he is, how he has changed. For that change you depend upon environment; and so long as there is the dependence on environment for righteous action, there must be means of escape, substitutions, call it religion or what you will. Whereas, for the true artist who is also truly spiritual there is spontaneous expression, which in itself is sufficient, complete, whole.

So what are you doing? What is happening to each one of you? What are you trying to do in your lives? You are seeking; and what are you seeking? There is a conflict between yourself and the constant movement of environment. You are seeking a means to overcome that environment, so as to perpetuate your own self which is but the result of that environment; or, because you have been thwarted so often by environment, which prevents you from self-expressing, as you call it, you seek a new means of self-expression through service to humanity, through economic adjustments, and all the rest of it.

Each one has to find out for what he is searching; if he is not searching, then there is satisfaction and decay. If there is conflict, there is the desire to overcome that conflict, to escape from that conflict, to dominate it. And as I have said, conflict can exist only between two false things, between that supposed reality which you call the "I", which to me is nothing else but the result of environment, and the environment itself. And hence if your mind is merely concerned with the overcoming of that struggle, then you are perpetuating falseness, and hence there is more conflict, more sorrow. But if you understand the significance of environment, that is, wealth, poverty, exploitation,

oppression, nationalities, religions, and all the inanities of social life in modern existence, not trying to overcome them but seeing their significance, then there must be individual action, and complete revolution of ideas and thought. Then there is no longer a struggle, but rather light dispelling darkness. There is no conflict between light and darkness. There is no conflict between truth and that which is false. There is only conflict where there are opposites.

June 16, 1934

Second Talk in The Oak Grove

You may remember that yesterday I was talking about the birth of conflict, and how the mind seeks a solution for it. I want to deal this morning with the whole idea of conflict and disharmony, and show the utter futility of mind trying to seek a solution for conflict, because the mere search for the solution will not do away with the conflict itself. When you seek a solution, a means of dissolving the conflict, you merely try to superimpose, or substitute in its place, a new set of ideas, a new set of theories, or you try to run away from conflict altogether. When people desire a solution for their conflict, that is what they seek.

If you observe, you will see that when there is conflict, you are at once seeking a solution for it. You want to find a way out of that conflict, and you generally *do* find a way out; but you have not solved the conflict, you have merely shifted it by substituting a new environment, a new condition, which will in turn produce further conflict. So let us look into this whole idea of conflict, from where it arises, and what we can do with it.

Now, conflict is the result of environment, isn't it? To put it differently, what is environment? When are you conscious of environment? Only when there is conflict and a resistance to that environment. So, if you observe, if you look into your lives, you will see that conflict is continually twisting, perverting, shaping your lives; and intelligence, which is the perfect harmony of mind and heart, has no part in your lives at all. That is, environment is continually shaping, moulding your lives to action, and naturally out of that continual twisting, moulding, shaping, perversion, conflict is born. So where there is this constant process of conflict there cannot be intelligence. And yet we think that by continually going through conflict we shall arrive at that intelligence, that fullness, and that plenitude of ecstasy. But by the accumulation of conflict we cannot find out how to live intelligently; you can find out how to live intelligently only when you understand the environment which is creating conflict, and mere substitution, that is, the introduction of new conditions, is not going to solve the conflict. And yet if you observe you will see that when there is conflict, mind is seeking a substitution. We either say, "It is heredity, economic conditions, past environment," or we assert our belief in karma, reincarnation, evolution; so we are trying to give excuses for the present conflict in which the

mind is caught, and are not trying to find out what is the cause of conflict itself, which is to inquire into the significance of environment.

Conflict then can exist only between environment—environment being economic and social conditions, political domination, neighbours—between that environment, and the result of environment which is the "I". Conflict can exist only so long as there is reaction to that environment which produces the "I", the self. The majority of people are unconscious of this conflict—the conflict between one's self, which is but the result of the environment, and the environment itself; very few are conscious of this continuous battle. One becomes conscious of that conflict, that di-harmony, that struggle between the false creation of the environment, which is the "I", and the environment itself, only through suffering. Isn't that so? It is only through acuteness of suffering, acuteness of pain, acuteness of disharmony, that you become conscious of the conflict.

What happens when you become conscious of the conflict? What happens when in that intensity of suffering you become fully conscious of the battle, the struggle which is going on? Most people want an immediate relief, an immediate answer. They want to shelter themselves from that suffering, and therefore they find various means of escape, which I mentioned yesterday, such as religions, excitements, inanities, and the many mysterious avenues of escape which we have created through our desire to protect ourselves from this struggle. Suffering makes one conscious of this conflict, and yet suffering will not lead man to that fullness, to that richness, that plenitude, that ecstasy of life, because after all, suffering can only awaken the mind to great intensity. And when the mind is acute, then it begins to question the environment, the conditions, and in that questioning, intelligence is functioning; and *is only intelligence that will lead man to the fullness of life and to discovery of the significance of sorrow.* Intelligence begins to function in the moment of acuteness of suffering, when mind and heart are no longer escaping, escaping through the various avenues which you have so cleverly made, which are so apparently reasonable, factual, real. If you observe carefully, without prejudice, you will see that so long as there is an escape you are not solving, you are not coming face to face with conflict, and therefore your suffering is merely the accumulation of ignorance. That is, when one ceases to escape, through the well-known channels, then in that acuteness of suffering, intelligence begins to function.

Please, I do not want to give you examples and similes, because I want you to think it out, and if I give examples I do all the thinking and you merely listen. Whereas if you begin to think about what I am

help I am often viciously opposed. How then can you say that there is no conflict between the false and the true?

Krishnamurti: I said yesterday that there can be struggle only between two false things, conflict between the environment and the result of environment which is the "I". Now between these two lie innumerable avenues of escape which the "I" has created, which we call vice, goodness, morality, moral standards, fears, and all the many opposites; and the struggle can exist only between the two, between the false creation of the environment which is the "I", and the environment itself. But there cannot be struggle between truth and that which is false. Surely that is obvious, isn't it? You may be viciously opposed because the other man is ignorant. It doesn't mean you mustn't fight—but don't assume the righteousness of fighting. Please, you know there is a natural way of doing things, a spontaneous, sweet way of doing things, without this aggressive, vicious righteousness.

First of all, in order to fight, you must know what you are fighting, so there must be understanding of the fundamental, not of the divisions between the false things. Now we are so conscious, we are so fully conscious of the divisions between the false things, between the result and the environment, that we fight them, and therefore we want to reform, we want to change, we want to alter, without fundamentally changing the whole structure of human life. That is, we still want to preserve the "I" consciousness which is the false reaction to environment; we want to preserve that and yet want to alter the world. In other words, you want to have your own bank account, your own possessions, you want to preserve the sense of "mine", and yet you want to alter the world so that there shall not be this idea of "me" and "yours".

So what one has to do is to find out if one is dealing with the fundamental, or merely with the superficial. And to me the superficial will exist so long as you are merely concerned with the alteration of environment so as to alleviate conflict. That is, you still want to cling to the "I" consciousness as "mine", but yet desire to alter the circumstances so that they will not create conflict in that "I". I call that superficial thought, and from that there naturally is superficial action. Whereas if you think fundamentally, that is, question the very root of the environment which is the "I", and therefore question the environment itself, then you are acting fundamentally, and therefore lastingly. And in that there is an ecstasy, in that there is a joy of which you

Question: In your talk yesterday you spoke of environment as the movement of the false. Do you include in environment all the creations of nature, including human forms?

Krishnamurti: Doesn't environment continually change? Doesn't it? For most people it doesn't change because change implies continual adjustment, therefore continual awareness of mind, and most people are concerned with the static condition of the environment. Yet environment is moving because it is beyond your control, and it is false so long as you do not understand its significance.

"Does environment include human forms?" Why set them apart from nature? We are not concerned so much with nature, because we have almost brought nature under control, but we have not understood the environment created by human beings. Look at the relationship between peoples, between two human beings, and all the conditions which human beings have created that we have not understood, even though we have largely understood and conquered nature through science.

So we are not concerned with the stability, with the continuance of an environment which we understand, because the moment we understand it there is no conflict. That is, we are seeking security, emotional and mental, and we are happy so long as that security is assured and therefore we never question environment, and hence the constant movement of environment is a false thing which is creating disturbance in each one. As long as there is conflict, it indicates that we have not understood the conditions placed about us; and that movement of environment remains false so long as we do not inquire into its significance, and we can only discover it in that state of acute consciousness of suffering.

Question: It is perfectly clear to me that the "I" consciousness is the result of environment, but do you not see that the "I" did not originate for the first time in this life? From what you say it is obvious that the "I" consciousness, being the result of environment, must have begun in the distant past and will continue in the future.

Krishnamurti: I know this is a question to catch me about reincarnation. But that doesn't matter. Now let's look into it.

First of all you will admit, if you think about it, that the "I" is the result of environment. Now to me it doesn't matter whether it is the

Take a primitive; what does he do? In him there is no discipline, no control, no suppression. He does what he desires to do, this primitive. The intelligent man also does what he desires, but with intelligence. Intelligence is not born out of self-discipline or suppression. In the one instance it is wholly the pursuit of desire, the primitive man pursuing the object he desires. In the other instance, the intelligent man sees the significance of desire and sees the conflict; the primitive man does not, he pursues anything he desires and creates suffering and pain. So to me self-discipline and suppression are both alike—they both deny intelligence.

Please experiment with what I have said about discipline, self-discipline. Don't reject it, don't say you must have self-discipline, because there will be chaos in the world—as if there were not already chaos; and again, don't merely accept what I say, agreeing that it is true. I am telling you something with which I have experimented and which I have found to be true. Psychologically I think it is true, because self-discipline implies a mind that is tethered to a particular thought or belief or ideal, a mind that is held by a condition; and as an animal that is tethered to a post can only wander within the distance of its rope, so does the mind which is tethered to a belief, which is perverted through self-discipline, wander only within the limitation of that condition. Therefore such a mind is not mind at all, it is incapable of thought. It may be capable of adjustment between the limitations of the post and the farthest point of its reach; but such a mind, such a heart cannot really think and feel. The mind and the heart are disciplined, crippled, perverted, through denying thought, denying affection. So you must observe, become aware how your own thought, how your own feelings are functioning, without wanting to guide them in any particular direction. First of all, before you guide them, find out how they are functioning. Before you try to change and alter thought and feeling, find out the manner of their working, and you will see that they are continually adjusting themselves within the limitations established by that point fixed by desire and the fulfillment of that desire. In awareness there is no discipline.

Let me take an example. Suppose that you are class-minded, class-conscious, snobbish. You don't know that you are snobbish, but you want to find out if you are; how will you find out? By becoming conscious of your thought and your emotions. Then what happens? Suppose that you discover that you are snobbish, then that very discovery creates a disturbance, a conflict, and that very conflict dissolves snobbishness. Whereas if you merely discipline the mind not to be snobbish, you are developing a different characteristic which is the

opposite of being a snob, and being deliberate; therefore false, is equally pernicious.

So, because we have established various patterns, various goals, aids, which we are continually, consciously or unconsciously, pursuing, we discipline our minds and hearts towards them, and therefore there must be control, perversion. Whereas if you begin to inquire into the conditions that create conflict, and thereby awaken intelligence, then that intelligence itself is so supreme that it is continually in movement and therefore there is never a static point which can create conflict.

Question: Granted that the "I" is made up of reactions from environment, by what method can one escape its limitations; or how does one go about the process of re-orientation, in order to avoid conflict between the two false things?

Krishnamurti: First of all, you want to know the method of escape from the limitations. Why? Why do you ask? Please, why do you always ask for a method, for a system? What does it indicate, this desire for a method? Every demand for a method indicates the desire to escape. You want me to lay down a system so that you may imitate that system. In other words, you want a system invented for you to superimpose on those conditions which are creating conflict, so that you can escape from all conflict. In other words you merely seek to adjust yourselves to a pattern, in order to escape from conflict or from your environment. That is the desire behind the demand for a method, for a system. You know life is not Pelmanism. The desire for a method indicates essentially the desire to escape.

"How does one go about the process of re-orientation in order to avoid constant conflict between the two false things?" First of all, are you aware that you are in conflict, before you want to know how to get away from it? Or, being aware of conflict, are you merely seeking a refuge, a shelter which will not create further conflict? So let us decide whether you want a shelter, a safety zone, which will no longer yield conflict, whether you want to escape from the present conflict to enter a condition in which there shall be no conflict; or whether you are unaware, unconscious of this conflict in which you exist. If you are unconscious of the conflict, that is, the battle that is taking place between that self and the environment, if you are unconscious of that battle, then why do you seek further remedies? Remain unconscious. Let the conditions themselves produce the necessary conflict, without

your rushing after, invoking artificially, falsely, a conflict which does not exist in your mind and heart. And you create artificially a conflict because you are afraid you are missing something. Life will not miss you. If you think it does, something is wrong with you. Perhaps you are neurotic, not normal.

If you are in conflict, you will not ask me for a method. Were I to give you a method you would merely be disciplining yourself according to that method, trying to imitate an ideal, a pattern which I have laid down, and therefore destroying your own intelligence. Whereas if you are really conscious of that conflict, in that consciousness suffering will become acute and in that acuteness, in that intensity, you will dissolve the cause of suffering, which is the lack of understanding of the environment.

You know we have lost all sense of living normally, simply, directly. To get back to that normality, that simplicity, that directness, you cannot follow methods, you cannot merely become automatic machines; and I am afraid most of us are seeking methods because we think that through them we shall realize fullness, stability and permanency. To me methods lead to slow stagnation and decay and they have nothing to do with real spirituality, which is, after all, the summation of intelligence.

Question: You speak of the necessity of a drastic revolution in the life of the individual. If he does not want to revolutionize his outward personal environment because of the suffering it would cause to his family and friends, will inward revolution lead him to the freedom from all conflict?

Krishnamurti: First of all, sirs, don't you also feel that a drastic revolution in the life of the individual is necessary? Or are you merely satisfied with things as they are, with your ideas of progress, evolution and your desire for attainment, with your longings and fluctuating pleasures? You know, the moment you begin to think, really begin to feel, you must have this burning desire for a drastic change, drastic revolution, complete re-orientation of thinking. Now, if you feel that that is necessary, then neither family nor friends will stand in the way. Then there is neither an outward revolution nor an inward revolution; there is only revolution, change. But the moment you begin to limit by saying, "I must not hurt my family, my friends, my priest, my capitalistic exploiter or state exploiter," then you really don't see the

necessity for radical change, you merely seek a change of environment. In that there is merely lethargy which creates further false environment and continues the conflict.

I think we give the rather false excuse that we must not hurt our families and our friends. You know when you want to do something vital, you do it, irrespective of your family and friends, don't you? Then you don't consider that you are going to hurt them. It is beyond your control; you feel so intensely, you think so completely that it carries you beyond the limitation of family circles, classified bondages. But you begin to consider family, friends, ideals, beliefs, traditions, the established order of things, only when you are still clinging to a particular safety, when there is not that inward richness, but merely the dependence on external stimulation for that inward richness. So if there is that full consciousness of suffering, brought about by conflict, then you are not held in the bondage of any particular orthodoxy, friends or family. You want to find out the cause of that suffering, you want to find out the significance of the environment which creates that conflict; then in that there is no personality, no limited thought of the "I". But it is only when you cling to that limited thought of the "I" that you have to consider how far you shall wander and how far you shall not wander.

Surely truth, or that Godhead of understanding, is not to be found by clinging either to family or tradition or habit. It is to be found only when you are completely naked, stripped of your longings, hopes, securities; and in that direct simplicity there is the richness of life.

Question: Can you explain why environment started being false instead of true? What is the origin of all this mess and trouble?

Krishnamurti: Who do you think created environment? Some mysterious God? Please, just a minute; who created environment, the social structure, the economic, the religious structure? We. Each one has contributed individually, until it has become collective, and the individual who has helped to create the collective, now is lost in the collective, for it has become his mould, his environment. Through the desire for security, financial, moral and spiritual, you have created a capitalistic environment in which there is nationality, class distinction and exploitation. We have created it, you and I. This thing hasn't miraculously come into being. You will again create another capitalistic, acquisitive system of a different kind, with a different nuance,

with a different colour, so long as you are seeking security. You may abolish this present pattern, but so long as there is possessiveness, you will create another capitalistic state, with a new phraseology, a new jargon.

And the same thing applies to religions, with all their absurd ceremonies, exploitations, fears. Who has created them? You and I. Throughout the centuries we have created these things and yielded to them through fear. It is the individual who has created false environment everywhere. And he has become a slave, and that false condition has resulted in a false search for the security of that self-consciousness which you call the "I", and hence the constant battle between the "I" and the false environment.

You want to know who has created this environment and all this appalling mess and trouble, because you want a redeemer to lift you out of that trouble and set you in a new heaven. Clinging to all your particular prejudices, hopes, fears and preferences, you have individually created this environment, so individually you must break it down and not wait for a system to come and sweep it away. A system *will* probably come and sweep it away and then you will merely become slaves to that system. The communistic system may come in, and then probably you will be using new words, but having the same reactions, only in a different manner, with a different tempo.

That is why I said the other day that if environment is driving you to a certain action, it is no longer righteous. It is only when there is action born out of the understanding of that environment that there is righteousness.

So individually we must become conscious. I assure you, you will then individually create something immense, not a society which is merely holding to an ideal and therefore decaying, but a society that is constantly in movement, not coming to a culmination and dying. Individuals establish a goal, strive after its attainment, and after attaining, collapse. They try all the time to reach some goal and stay at that stage which they have attained. As the individual so the state—the state is trying all the time to reach an ideal, a goal. Whereas to me the individual must be in constant movement, must ever be becoming, not seeking a culmination, not pursuing a goal. Then self-expression, which is society, will be ever in constant movement.

Question: Do you consider that karma is the interaction between the false environment and the false "I"?

Krishnamurti: You know karma is a Sanskrit word which means to act, to do, to work, and also it implies cause and effect. Now karma is the bondage, the reaction born out of the environment which the mind has not understood. As I tried to explain yesterday, if we do not understand a particular condition, naturally the mind is burdened with that condition, with that lack of understanding; and with that lack of understanding we function and act, and therefore create further burdens, greater limitations.

So one has to find out what creates this lack of understanding, what prevents the individual from gathering the full significance of the environment, whether it be the past environment or the present. And to discover that significance, mind must really be free of prejudice. It is one of the most difficult things to be really free of a bias, of a temperament, of a twist; and to approach environment with a fresh openness, a directness, demands a great deal of perception. Most minds are biased through vanity, through the desire to impress others by being somebody, or through the desire to attain truth, or to escape from their environment, or expand their own consciousness—only they call this by a special spiritual name—or through their national prejudices. All these desires prevent the mind from perceiving directly the full worth of the environment; and as most minds are prejudiced, the first thing that one has to become conscious of is one's own limitations. And when you begin to be conscious, there is conflict in that consciousness. When you know that you are really brutally proud or conceited, in the very consciousness of conceit it begins to dissipate, because you perceive the absurdity of it; but if you begin merely to cover it up, it creates further diseases, further false reactions.

So to live each moment now without the burden of the past or of the present, without that crippling memory created by the lack of understanding, mind must ever meet things anew. It is fatal to meet life with the burden of certainty, with the conceit of knowledge, because, after all, knowledge is merely a thing of the past. So when you come to that life with a freshness, then you will know what it is to live without conflict, without this continual straining effort. Then you wander far on the floods of life.

June 18, 1934

Fourth Talk in The Oak Grove

I shall first answer some of the questions that have been put to me, and then give a brief talk.

Question: Does intuition include past experience and something else, or only past experience?

Krishnamurti: To me intuition is intelligence, and intelligence is not past experience, it is the understanding of past experience. I am going to talk presently about this whole idea of past experience, memory, intelligence and mind, but I shall now answer this particular point, whether intuition is born of the past.

To me, the past is a burden, the past being but gaps in understanding; and, if you really base your action on the past, on so-called intuition, it is bound to lead you astray. Whereas if there is spontaneous action in the ever-moving present, in that action is intelligence and that intelligence is intuition. Intelligence is not to be separated from intuition. Most people like to separate intuition from intelligence, because intuition gives them a certain security and hope. Many people say they act "on intuition", that is, they act without reason, without depth of thought. Many people accept a theory, an idea because they say their "intuition" tells them that it is true. There is no reason behind it, they merely accept it because that theory or idea gives them some solution, some comfort. It is really not reason that is functioning, but it is merely their own hopes, their own longings which are directing their minds. Whereas intelligence is detached from environment and therefore there is reason, thought, behind it.

Question: How can I act freely and without self-repression when I know that my action must hurt those that I love? In such a case, what is the test of right action?

Krishnamurti: I think I answered this question the other day, but probably the questioner wasn't here, so I will answer it again. The test of right action is in its spontaneity, but to act spontaneously is to be

greatly intelligent. The majority of people have merely reactions which are perverted, twisted, and stifled because of the lack of intelligence. Where intelligence is functioning, there is spontaneous action.

Now the questioner wants to know how he can act freely and without self-repression when he knows his action must hurt those he loves. You know, to love is to be free—both parties are free. Where there is the possibility of pain, where there is the possibility of suffering in love, it is not love, it is merely a subtle form of possession, of acquisitiveness. If you love, really love someone, there is no possibility of giving him pain when you do something that you think is right. It is only when you want that person to do what you desire or he wants you to do what he desires, that there is pain. That is, you like to be possessed; you feel safe, secure, comfortable; though you know that comfort is but transient, you take shelter in that comfort, in that transience. So each struggle for comfort, for encouragement, really but betrays the lack of inward richness; and therefore an action separate, apart from the other individual naturally creates disturbance, pain and suffering; and one individual has to suppress what he really feels in order to adjust himself to the other. In other words, this constant repression, brought about by so-called love, destroys the two individuals. In that love there is no freedom; it is merely a subtle bondage. When you feel very ardently that you must do something, you do it, sometimes cunningly and subtly, but you do it. There is always this urge to do, to act independently.

Question: Am I right in believing that all conditions and environment become right to a really intelligent mind? Is it not a question of seeing the art in the pattern?

Krishnamurti: To an intelligent mind environment yields its significance; therefore that intelligent mind is the master of environment, that mind is free of environment, is not conditioned by environment. What conditions the mind? The lack of understanding. Isn't it? Not environment, environment does not limit the mind; what limits the mind is the lack of understanding of a particular condition.

Where there is intelligence, mind is not conditioned by any environment, because it is all the time conscious, aware and functioning, and therefore discerning, perceiving the full worth of the environment. Mind can only become conditioned by the environment when it is lethargic and lazy, trying to escape from the condition itself. Though mind may

think in that condition, it is not functioning truly, it is only thinking within that limited circle of condition, which to me is not thinking at all.

So what creates intelligence, what awakens intelligence is this perception of true values, and as the mind is crippled with so many values imposed on it by tradition, one has to be free of these past experiences, past burdens in order to understand the present environment. So the battle is between the past and the present. The struggle is between the background which we have cultivated through the centuries and the ever changing circumstances in the present. Now, a mind that is clouded by the past cannot understand these swift changes of environment. In other words, to understand the present, mind must be supremely free of the past; that is, it must have a spontaneous appreciation of values in the present. I am going to talk about that later on.

"Is it not a question of seeing the art in the pattern?" Surely. That is, in the pattern of circumstances, in the pattern of environment, mind must see the subtle value, so hidden, so delicate; and to perceive that subtlety, that delicacy, the mind must be alive, pliable, acute, not burdened by values of yesterday.

Question: There seems to be the idea that liberation is a goal, a culmination. What is the difference in this case between striving for liberation and striving for any other culmination? Surely the idea of an end, a goal, a culmination is wrong. How then ought we to regard liberation if not in this way?

Krishnamurti: I am afraid the questioner has not been hearing what I have been talking about; probably he has read some old books of mine and then has put the question.

Now, mind is seeking a culmination, a goal, an end, because mind wants to be certain, assured. Take away all the assurances and certainties from the mind, which are subtle forms of self-glorification or of the craving for self-continuance. Take all that away from the mind, strip it naked, and then you will see that the mind is battling again for security, for shelter, because from that security it can judge, it can function, it can act safely like an animal tethered to a post.

As I said, liberation is not an end, it is not a goal; it is the understanding of right values, eternal values. Intelligence is ever becoming, it has no end, no finality. In the desire to attain there is a subtle craving for self-continuance, glorified self-continuance; and every struggle, every

effort to attain liberation indicates an escape from the present. This summation of intelligence, which is liberation, is not to be understood through effort. After all, you make an effort when you want, when you desire to acquire something. But liberation is not to be acquired, truth is not to be acquired. So where there is a craving for liberation, for a culmination, for attainment, there must be an effort to sustain, to preserve, to perpetuate that consciousness which we call the "I". The very essence of that "I" is an effort to reach a culmination, because it lives in a series of movements of memory, moving towards an end.

"But then, how ought we to regard liberation if not in this way?" Why regard it at all? Why do you want liberation? Is it because I have been talking about it for the last ten years? Or is it because you want to escape from conditions, or because it will give you greater excitement, greater stimulation, greater intellectual domination? Why do you want liberation? You say, "I am not happy, and if I can find liberation there will be happiness; because I am in misery, if I find this other, then misery will disappear." If you say so, then you are merely seeking substitution.

Liberation is not to be "regarded" in any way. It is born. It comes into being only when the mind is not trying to escape from the condition in which it is caught, but rather to understand the significance of that condition which creates conflict. You see, as you don't understand the condition, the environment which creates conflict, you seek an idea, a culmination, an end, a goal, saying to yourself, "If I understand that, this will disappear," or, "If I have that, I can impose that on this condition." So it is but a subtle form of continual escape from the present. All ideals, beliefs, goals and culminations are but ways out of the present. Whereas if you really come to think of it, the more you are pursuing an end, a goal, an aim, a belief, an ideal, the more you are burdening the future, because you are escaping from the present and therefore creating more and more limitation, conflict, sorrow.

Question: Some people say your idea is that we should become liberated now, while we have the opportunity, and that we can become masters later on, at some other time. But if we are to become masters at all, why is it not good for us to begin to set our feet on that way now?

Krishnamurti: Is there the opportunity now for you to be liberated? What do you mean by opportunity? How could you be liberated now? By some miraculous process? And later on become a master? Sir,

what is a master, and what is liberation? What is masterhood? Surely if it is not liberation it cannot be masterhood? If liberation is not the summation of intelligence in the present, surely that intelligence is not going to be acquired in some far distant future. So you want liberation now and masterhood afterwards? I wonder why you want liberation now. I am afraid liberation has no meaning when you *want* it. And this idea of becoming a master—the questioner must think that life is like passing an examination, becoming something—I am afraid this becoming a master, becoming liberated has no meaning to you. Don't you see, when you really don't want to become *anything*, but live completely in one day, in the richness of a single day, you will know what masterhood or liberation is. This wanting is continually creating a future which can never be fulfilled, therefore you are living incompletely in the present.

During the last three days I have been talking about mind and intelligence. Now to me there is no division between mind and intelligence. Mind stripped of all its memories and hindrances, functioning spontaneously, fully, being aware, creates understanding, and that is intelligence, that is ecstasy; that to me is immortality, timelessness. Intelligence is timelessness, and intelligence is mind itself. This intelligence is the real, is mind itself, it is not to be divided from mind; this intelligence is ecstasy, it is ever becoming, ever in movement.

Now memory is but the impediment to that intelligence; memory is independent of that intelligence; memory is the perpetuation of that "I" consciousness which is the result of environment, of that environment the full significance of which the mind has not seen. So memory stupefies, thwarts the ever becoming intelligence, the ever moving, timeless intelligence. Mind is intelligence, but memory has imposed itself on mind. That is, memory being that "I" consciousness, identifies itself with the mind, and the "I" consciousness comes as it were between intelligence and the mind, thus dividing, stupefying, thwarting, perverting it. So memory, identifying itself with mind, tries to become intelligence, which to me is wrong—if I may use the word "wrong" here—because mind itself is intelligence, and it is memory that perverts the mind and so clouds intelligence. And hence mind seems ever to seek that timeless intelligence, which is the mind itself.

So what is memory? Isn't memory incident, experience, fear, hope, longing, belief, idea, prejudice and tradition, action, deed, with their

subtle and complex reactions? The moment there is hope, longing, fear, prejudice, temperament, it conditions the mind, and that conditioning creates memory, which obscures the clarity of mind which is intelligence. This memory rolls through time, coagulating and hardening itself into the self-consciousness of the "I". When you talk about the "I", it is that. It is the crystallizing, the hardening of the memory of your reactions, the reactions of experience, incidents, beliefs, ideals, and after becoming a solidified mass, that memory becomes identified and confused with the mind. If you think it over you will see this. Self-consciousness, or that consciousness of the particular, the "I", is nothing else but the bundle of memory, and time is nothing else but the field in which it can function and play. So this hardened mass of reactions cannot be resolved, cannot resolve itself backwards in time through analysis, the analysis of the past, because this very looking back, this analysis of the past is one of the tricks of memory itself. You know, taking an unhealthy pleasure in reasserting and reconditioning the past in the present is the constant activity, the *métier* of memory, isn't it? Please, this is not cleverness, this is not a philosophical concept. Just think it out for a minute, and you will see that this is true. There is this mass of reactions born out of condition, environment, prejudice, various longings and all these, therefore there is the thing which you call the "I".

Then there is born this idea that you must dissolve the "I", because of what I have been saying. Or you yourself feel the stupidity of it, so you begin to unwind; memory begins to unwind itself backward into the past, which is the process of self-analysis. And if you really come to think of it, memory itself is taking an unhealthy pleasure in reconditioning the past in the present. And likewise, the future of memory is a greater hardening through further craving, further accumulation of experiences and reactions. In other words, time is memory or self-consciousness. You cannot resolve or dissolve self-consciousness by going into the past. The past is but the accumulation of memory, and delving into the past is not going to resolve that consciousness in the present; nor going into the future—which is but further accumulation, further craving, further reaction and hardening, which we call beliefs, ideals, hopes—the future which is still involved in time. As long as this process of memory as past and future continues, intelligence can never act with completeness or fullness in the present.

Intuition as commonly understood is based on the past, the past accumulation of memory, past accumulation of experiences, which is but a warning to act carefully—or freely—in the present. As I said, this timelessness is not a philosophical concept to me, it is a reality,

and you will see that it is a reality if you experiment with what I am saying. That is, you will see that it is a reality if your mind is not clogged by the past accumulation which you call memory, which functions and directs you in the present, preventing you from being fully intelligent and therefore living completely in the present.

So liberation or truth or God is the release of the mind, which is itself intelligence, from the burden of memory. I have explained to you what I mean by memory, not the memory of facts or falsehoods, but the burden placed on the mind through self-consciousness which is memory, and that memory is the reaction to the environment which has not been understood. Immortality is not the perpetuation of that "I" consciousness, which is but the result of a false environment, but immortality is the freedom, the release of the mind from the burden of memory.

June 19, 1934

Fifth Talk in The Oak Grove

This morning I want to talk about fear, which creates, which necessitates compulsion, influence.

Now, we have divided mind into thought, reason, intellect; but, as I explained in my last talk, to me mind is intelligence, self-creative but clouded over by memory; mind, which is intelligence, is clouded over by memory and is confused with that "I" consciousness, the result of environment. So mind becomes enslaved by the environment which it itself has created through craving, and therefore there is fear continually. Mind has created environment, and as long as we do not understand that environment there must be fear. We do not give our complete thought to environment and we are not fully conscious of it, so mind becomes enslaved to that environment and thereby there is fear; and compulsion is the instrument of fear. So naturally the lack of understanding of environment is brought about by that lack of intelligence, and because we do not understand environment, fear is thereby created, and fear necessitates influence, either outer or inner.

And how is this continual compulsion created, which has become the instrument, this penetrating instrument of fear? Memory clouds the mind, and this, I have said over and over again, is the result of the lack of understanding of the environment which creates conflict, and memory becomes self-consciousness. This mind, clouded over, limited and confined by memory, seeks perpetuation of the result of environment which is the "I"; so in perpetuating the "I", mind seeks the adjustment, alteration or modification of environment, its growth and expansion. You know, mind is continually seeking adjustment to the environment; but adjustment to environment does not bring about understanding, nor can we see the significance of that environment by merely modifying the state of mind or trying to change or expand that environment. Because mind is continually seeking its own protection, it gets clouded over by memory which has become confused, identified with self-consciousness—that self-consciousness which desires to perpetuate itself; therefore it tries to alter, adjust, modify the environment, or in other words, mind seeks to make the "I", as it thinks, immortal, universal and cosmic. Isn't it so?

So mind, which seeks immortality, really desires the continuance of this "I" consciousness, the perpetuation of environment; that is, so long as mind clings to the idea of "I" consciousness, which is but the

lack of understanding of environment and therefore the cause of conflict, so long will it seek, in that limitation, its own perpetuation, and this perpetuation we call immortality, or that cosmic consciousness in which the particular still remains. So long as mind, which is intelligence, is held in the bondage of memory, which is the "I" consciousness, there is the search of the false for the false. This "I", as I explained, is the false reaction to environment; there is a false cause and it is ever seeking a false solution, a false effect, a false result. So when the mind clouded by memory is seeking to perpetuate itself as self-consciousness, it is seeking false immortality, a false cosmic expansion, or whatever you like to call it.

In this process of the perpetuation of the "I", that self-preserving memory, in the perpetuation of that "I" is born fear—not superficial fear, but the fundamental fear with which I shall deal presently. Remove that fear, which has as its outward expression nationality, growth, achievement, success—remove that fundamental fear, the anxiety for the perpetuation of that "I", and all fears cease. So fear exists as long as there is this desire for the perpetuation of that thing which is false; this "I" is false, therefore you must have a false reaction, which is fear itself. And where there is fear there must be discipline, compulsion, influence, domination, the search for power which the mind glorifies as virtue and as divine. If you really think of it you will see that where there is intelligence there cannot be the hunt for power.

Now all life is moulded by fear and conflict, and hence by compulsion, by the enforcing of decrees and fetters which some consider virtuous and worthy, and others baneful and evil. Isn't that so? These are the restraints you have established in your search for perpetuation, free from fear; in that search you have created disciplines, codes and authorities, and your life is moulded, controlled and shaped by compulsion of various forms and degrees. Some call that compulsion virtuous, others evil.

We have first of all, outward compulsion which is the restraint of environment upon the individual. The ordinary person whom you call unevolved, unspiritual, is controlled by environment, outward environment, that is, by religion, codes of conduct, moral standards, political and social authority; he is a slave to all these because all these are rooted in the economic needs of the individual. Aren't they? Remove entirely the economic needs upon which the individual depends, then codes of conduct, moral standards, political, economic and social values disappear. So in these restraints of the outer environment which create conflict between the individual and the outer environment, in which the individual is crushed, warped, twisted, he becomes increasingly unintel-

ligent. The individual who is merely conditioned all the time by outward environment, shaped by certain rules, laws, reactions, edicts, moral standards—the more and more you crush him, the less and less intelligent he becomes. But intelligence is the understanding of environment, seeing its subtle significance freed from compulsion.

These restraints imposed on the individual, which he calls outer environment, have as their exponents the quacks and the exploiters in religion, in popular morality, and in the political and economic life of man. The exploiter is the individual who uses you consciously or unconsciously, and you yield to him consciously or unconsciously, because you do not understand; you become the exploited economically, socially, politically, religiously, and he becomes your exploiter. So in that way life becomes a school, a frame, a steel frame, in which the individual is beaten into shape, in which he becomes merely a machine—the individual becomes merely a cog in a machine, thoughtless and rigidly limited. Life becomes a continual struggle, a battle, and therefore he has established this false idea that life is a series of lessons to be learned, to be acquired, so that he may be forewarned, so that he may meet life anew tomorrow, but with his preconceived ideas. Life becomes merely a school, not a thing to be lived, to be enjoyed, to be lived ecstatically, fully, without fear.

The outer environment forces the individual, crushes him into this steel frame of standards, of morality, of religious ideas, of moral edicts, and as the individual is crushed from the outside, he seeks and escapes into a world which he calls the inner. Naturally, when the mind is being twisted, shaped, perverted by outer environment, and there is constant conflict outside, constant battle, constant false adjustments, the mind hopes for tranquillity, for happiness, for a different world; so the individual builds up a romantic haven of escape in which he seeks compensation for the loss and suffering in the outer world.

Please, as I said, you are here to find out, to criticize, not to oppose. You can oppose after you have thought over very carefully what I have been saying. You can put up barriers if you wish to, but first find out fully what it is that I want to convey; and to do that you must be super-critical, aware, intelligent.

As I have said, being crushed by outward circumstances which create suffering, and in an effort to escape from those outward circumstances, the individual creates an inner world, begins to develop an inner law and creates his own individual restraints, which he calls self-discipline, or co-operation with that which he has learned to call his high self.

Most people—the so-called spiritual people—have rejected the outer force of environment and its influence, but have developed an inner

law, an inner standard, an inner discipline, which they call bringing the high self down to the low; that is in other words, merely substitution. So there is self-discipline. Then there is that which is called the inner voice, whose power and control is far greater even than the outward environment. But what is after all the difference between the one and the other, the outer and the inner? They are both controlling, perverting the mind which is intelligence, through this desire for self-perpetuation. And also you have what you call intuition, which is merely the unfettered fulfillment of your own secret hopes and desires. So you have filled the inner world, what you call the inner world, with all these—self-discipline, the inner voice, intuition. All, if you come to think of it, are subtle forms of that same conflict, carried into a different world in which there is no understanding, but merely a moulding, an adjusting to a more subtle, what you call a more spiritual, environment.

You know in the outer world some have sought and found social distinctions, and likewise the so-called spiritual people merely seek in this inner world, and generally find, their spiritual peers and superiors; and again as there is conflict in the outer between individuals, so there is created in this inner world a spiritual conflict between ideals, attainment, and their own cravings. You see then what has been created.

In the outer world there is no expression for the mind clouded by memory, for that "I" consciousness there is no expression, because the environment is too strong, too powerful, too crushing; there you fit into the mould, or if you don't you are broken. So you develop an inner or more subtle form of environment, in which exactly the same process takes place. That environment which you have created is an escape from the outer, and there again you have standards, moral laws, intuitions, the high self, inner voice, and to them you are constantly adjusting. This is a fact.

In essence these restraints which we call the outer and inner, are born of craving, and so there is fear; and from fear there comes restraint, compulsion, influence, and the desire for power, which are but the outward expressions of fear. Where there is fear there cannot be intelligence, and as long as we have not understood that, there must be this division in life as the outer and the inner, and therefore our actions must always be influenced, either compelled by the outer, and therefore false, or compelled by the inner, which is equally false, because in the inner also you are trying merely to adjust to certain other standards.

Fear is created when the false seeks a perpetuation of itself in the false environment. And so what happens to our action, which is our

daily conduct, to our thought and emotion,—what is happening to these?

Mind and heart are shaping themselves to environment, external environment, but when they find that they cannot, for the compulsion becomes too strong, they then turn to an inner condition in which the mind and heart seek perfect ease and satisfaction. Or they have thoroughly satisfied themselves through economic, social, religious or political achievements, and then they turn to the inner, there also to succeed, to be successful, to attain; and to attain, they must have always a culmination, a goal, which but becomes the condition to which the mind and heart are continually adjusting themselves.

So in the meantime what happens to our feelings, to our emotions, to our thoughts, to our love, to our reason? What happens when you are merely adjusting, when you are merely modifying, altering? What happens to anything—what happens to a house whose walls you are merely decorating though its foundations are rotten? So likewise our thoughts and our emotions are merely taking shape, altering themselves, modifying themselves after a pattern, either the external or the inward pattern; or according to an external compulsion or an inward direction. So greatly are our actions being limited through influence, that all reason merely becomes the imitation of a pattern, an adjustment to a condition, and love becomes but another form of fear. Our whole life—after all our life is our thoughts and our emotions, our joys and our pains—our whole life remains incomplete, our whole process of thought or the expression of that life is merely an adjustment, a modification, never a fullness, a completeness. And hence there arises problem after problem, the adjustment to environment which must be constantly changing, and conformity to patterns, which also must vary. So you go on with this battle, and this battle you call evolution, the growth of self, the expansion of that consciousness which is but memory. You have invented words to pacify your mind, but continue with this struggle.

Now, if you really ponder over this—and I think you have an opportunity during these days, those of you who stay quietly here—if you recognize this and without the desire to alter, without the desire to modify, become aware of this outward environment, of these circumstances, conditions, and the inner world in which there are the same conditions, the same environments, which you have called merely by more subtle, more lovely names; if you really become aware of this, then you will begin to understand the true significance of the outer and the inner; there is an immediate perception, the release of life, then mind becomes intelligence and it can function naturally, creatively, without this constant battle. Then mind—intelligence—recognizes the obstacles, and because of its understanding of these obstacles, it pene-

trates; there is no adjustment, there is no modification, there is only understanding. Hence intelligence does not depend on the outer or the inner, and in that awareness there is no desire, no craving, but the perception of what is true. To perceive what is true, there cannot be craving.

You know, when there is a craving, your mind is already clouded, is already perverted, because mind identifies itself with one and rejects the other—where there is craving there is no understanding; but when mind does not identify itself with the "I" but becomes aware of both the outer and the inner, of the subtle divisions, of the various emotions, of the delicate nuances of mind dividing itself as memory and intelligence—then in that awareness you will see the full significance of the environment which we have created throughout the centuries, that environment which we call the outer, and that which we call the inner, both of which are continually changing, adjusting themselves to each other.

All that you are now concerned with is modification, alteration, adjustment, and therefore there must be fear. Fear has its instruments in compulsion, and compulsion exists only when there is no understanding, when intelligence is not functioning normally.

June 22, 1934

Sixth Talk in The Oak Grove

I will give a brief talk first and then answer some of the questions that have been put to me.

I dealt yesterday with the whole idea of fear and how it necessitates compulsion; this morning I am going to deal again, briefly, with the way incompleteness creates compulsion. Where there is incompleteness there is the desire for guidance, for authority, for that moulding influence which has become tradition, tradition which is no longer thought but which acts merely as a guide. Whereas to me tradition should be a means of awakening thought, not dampening, killing thought. Where there is insufficiency, there must be compulsion; and out of this compulsion is born a particular mode of life or a method of action, and therefore further conflict, further struggle, further pain. That is, where one, consciously or unconsciously, feels the poignancy of insufficiency, there must be conflict, there must be misery and a sense of shallowness and emptiness and of the utter futility of life. One may not be conscious of this insufficiency, or one may be conscious of it.

So where there is insufficiency, what is the process of the mind? What happens when one becomes conscious of this emptiness, this shallowness within one's self? What do we do when we feel, when we become conscious of this emptiness, of this void in ourselves? We desire to fill that emptiness, and we look for a pattern, for a mould created by another; we imitate, follow that pattern, we discipline ourselves in that mould which another has established, hoping that we may thereby fill this emptiness, this shallowness of which we have become more or less conscious.

That pattern, that mould begins to influence our lives, compelling us to adjust ourselves, our minds, hearts and actions to that particular pattern. So we begin to live, not within our own experience, within our own *understanding*, but within the *expression*, the *idea*, the *limitations* of another's experience. That is what is happening. If you really think about it for a while, you will see that we begin to reject our own particular experiences and the understanding of these experiences, because we feel that insufficiency, and we turn to imitate, to copy and to live through another's experience. And when we look to another's experience and do not live by our own understanding, there naturally comes more and more insufficiency, more and more conflict; but also if we say to ourselves that we must live by our own experience, our own under-

standing, we again turn that into an ideal, into another pattern, and after that pattern we shape our lives.

Suppose that you say to yourself, "I am not going to depend on another's experience, but will live by my own," then surely you have already created a mould for your adjustment. When you say, "I shall live by my own experience," you are already placing a limitation on your thought, for this idea that you must live by your own understanding creates complacency, which is only an ineffectual adjustment leading to stagnation. You know most people say that they will reject the outward pattern which they are constantly imitating, and will try to live within their own understanding. They say, "We will do only what we understand"; and thereby they create another pattern which they weave into their lives. And then what happens? They become more and more satisfied; hence they slowly decay.

We look, for the dissipation of this insufficiency, to mere action, because where there is insufficiency and emptiness our one desire is to fill that emptiness and so we look to action merely to fill that. Again, what do we do when we look to an action to complete that insufficiency? We are merely trying through accumulation to fill that void and so we are not trying to find out what the cause of insufficiency is.

Please, when you feel that you are insufficient, what happens? You try to fill that insufficiency, you try to become rich, and you say that to become rich, to become complete, you must look to another, so you begin to adjust your own thoughts and feelings to the ideas and experiences of another. But this does not give you richness, this does not bring about completeness or fulfillment. And then you say to yourself, "I will try to live by my own understanding," which has its dangers, as I pointed out, leading to complacency; and if you merely look to action, saying, "I shall go out into the world and act so as to become rich, complete," you are again, by substitution, trying to fill that void. Whereas if you become aware through action, then you will find out the cause of insufficiency. That is, instead of seeking completeness, you create action, through intelligence.

Now what is action? It is after all what we think and feel. And as long as you are not aware of your own thinking, of your own feeling, there must be insufficiency, and no amount of outward activity is going to replenish you. That is, only intelligence can dispel this emptiness, and not accumulation; and intelligence is, as I have pointed out, perfect harmony of mind and heart. So if you understand the functioning of your own thought and your own emotion, and thereby in that action become aware, then there is intelligence, which dispels insufficiency

and which does not try to replace it by sufficiency, completeness, because intelligence itself is completeness.

So when there is completeness there cannot be compulsion. But disharmony, incompleteness, creates separation between mind and heart. Isn't that so? What is disharmony? It is the consciousness of the division between what you think and what you feel, and thereby in that distinction there is conflict. Whereas to me, to think and to feel is the same. So having conflict and disharmony, and having divided the mind from feelings, we then further separate and divide mind and heart from intelligence—intelligence which to me is truth, beauty and love. That is, conflict, which as I have explained is the struggle between the result of environment, which is the "I" consciousness, and the environment itself—that conflict between the result of environment and environment itself, brings about struggle which produces disharmony. We divide mind from emotion, and having divided mind from emotion, we proceed still further to divide intelligence from mind and heart; whereas to me they are one. Intelligence is thought and emotion in perfect harmony, and therefore intelligence is beauty itself, inherently, not a thing to be sought after.

When there is great conflict, great disharmony, when there is the full consciousness of emptiness, then there arises the search for beauty, truth and love to influence and to direct our lives. That is, being aware of that emptiness, you externalize beauty in nature, in art, in music, and begin to surround yourself artificially with these expressions in order that they may become in your life, influences for refinement, culture and harmony. Isn't that the process the mind goes through? As I said, through conflict we have divided intelligence from mind and emotion, and then there comes the consciousness of that insufficiency, that void. Then we begin to seek happiness, completeness, in art, in music, in nature, in religious ideals, and these begin to influence our lives, to control, to dominate and to guide us, and we think that in this way we shall arrive at that completeness; we hope through the accumulation of positive influences and experiences that we can overcome disharmony and conflict. This is merely going further and further away from that which is intelligence, and therefore from truth, beauty and love, which is completeness itself.

That is, in our feeling of insufficiency, incompleteness, we begin to accumulate, hoping to become complete through this gathering of experiences and the enjoyment of other people's ideas and patterns. Whereas to me incompleteness disappears when there is intelligence, and intelligence itself is beauty and truth. We cannot see this so long as mind and heart are divided, and they divide themselves through

conflict. We separate intelligence itself from mind and heart, and this process goes on continually, this process of separation and the search for fulfillment. But fulfillment lies in intelligence itself, and to awaken that intelligence is to find out what creates disharmony and therefore division.

What creates disharmony in our lives? The lack of understanding of environment, of our surroundings. When you begin to question and understand environment, its full worth and significance, not try to imitate or follow it or adjust yourselves to it or escape from it, then there is born intelligence, which is beauty, truth and love.

Question: In your opinion, would it be better for me to become a deaconess of the Protestant Episcopal Church, or could I be of greater service to the world by remaining as I am?

Krishnamurti: I suppose the questioner wants to know how to help the world, not whether she should join some church or other, which is of little importance.

How is one to help the world? Surely by not creating more sectarian divisions, by not creating more nationalism. Nationalism is, after all, the growth, the fulfillment of economic exploitation, and religions are the crystallized outcome of certain sets of beliefs and creeds. If one wants really to help the world, it cannot be, from my point of view, through any organized religion, whether it be Christianity with its innumerable sects, or Hinduism with its innumerable sects, or any other religion. These are in reality pernicious divisions of mind, of humanity. And yet we think that if all the world became Christian, then there would be the brotherhood of religions, and the unity of life. To me religion is the false result of a false cause, the cause being conflict, and religion merely a means of escape from that conflict. So the more you develop and strengthen the sectarian divisions of religion, the less true brotherhood there will be; and the more you strengthen nationalism, the less will be the unity of man.

Question: Is greed the product of environment or of human nature?

Krishnamurti: What is human nature? Isn't it itself the product of

environment? Why divide them? Is there such a thing as human nature apart from environment? Some believe that the distinction between human nature and environment is artificial, for by altering the environment they say that human nature can be changed and moulded. After all, greed is merely the result of false environment, therefore of human nature itself.

When the individual tries to understand his environment, the conditions in which he lives, then because there is intelligence there can be no greed. Then greed would not be a vice or a sin to be overcome. You do not understand and alter the environment which produces greed, but you fear the result and call it sin. But the mere search for perfect environment, therefore perfect human nature, cannot produce intelligence; but where there is intelligence there is the understanding of the environment, therefore freedom from its reactions. Now environment or society forces you, urges you to be self-protective. But if you begin to understand the environment which produces greed, then in seeing the significance of environment, greed vanishes altogether, and you do not then replace it by its opposite.

Question: I understand you to say that conflict ceases when it is faced without the desire to escape. I love someone who doesn't love me, and I am lonely and miserable. I honestly think I am facing my conflict, and I am not seeking an escape; but I am still lonely and miserable. So what you say has not worked. Can you tell me why?

Krishnamurti: Perhaps you are merely trying to use my words as a means of escape; perhaps you are using my words, my ideas to fill your own emptiness.

Now you say you have faced the conflict. I wonder if you really have. You say you love someone; but you really want to possess that person, therefore there is conflict. And why do you want to possess? Because you have the idea that through possession you will find happiness, completeness.

So the questioner has not really faced the problem, he desires to possess the other and hence is limiting his own affection. Because after all, when you really love someone, in that love there is freedom from possession. We have occasionally, rarely, that sense of intense affection in which there is no possessiveness, acquisitiveness. And this leads us back to what I just now said in my talk, that possessiveness exists so long as there is insufficiency, the lack of inward richness; and that

"I", that egotistic limitation? Why do you think it is necessary? If you say it is necessary because you seek happiness, then that self-consciousness, that limited particularity of the ego will still continue. But if you say, "I see conflict, my mind and heart are caught up in disharmony, but I see the cause of this disharmony, which is the lack of understanding of environment which has created that self-consciousness," then there is no void to be filled. I am afraid the questioner has not understood this at all.

Please let me explain this once again. What we call self-consciousness, or that "I" consciousness, is nothing else but the result of environment; that is, when the mind and heart do not understand environment, the surroundings, the conditions in which an individual finds himself, then through the lack of that understanding, conflict is created. Mind is clouded by this conflict, and this continual conflict creates memory and becomes identified with mind and thus this idea of "I", of ego-consciousness, becomes hardened. Hence further conflict, suffering and pain. But the understanding of the circumstances, the surroundings, the conditions which create this conflict does not come through substitution but through intelligence, which is mind and love; that intelligence which is ever self-creating, ever in movement. And that to me is eternity, a timeless reality.

Whereas, you are seeking the perpetuation of that consciousness which is the result of environment, which you call the "I", and that "I" can disappear only when there is the understanding of environment. Intelligence then functions normally, without restraint or compulsion. Then there is not this frightful struggle, this search for beauty, search for truth, and the constant battle of possessive love, because intelligence itself is complete.

June 23, 1934

Seventh Talk in The Oak Grove

Let us for a moment, imaginatively at least, look over the world from a point of view which will reveal the inner workings and the outer workings of man, his creations and his battles; and if you can do that imaginatively for a moment, what do you see spread before you? You see man imprisoned by innumerable walls, walls of religion, of social, political and national limitations, walls created by his own ambitions, aspirations, fears, hopes, security, prejudices, hate and love. Within these barriers and prisons he is held, limited by the coloured maps of national boundaries, racial antagonisms, class struggles and cultural group distinctions. You see man throughout the world imprisoned, enclosed by the limitations, the walls of his own creation. Through these walls and through these enclosures he is trying to express what he feels and what he thinks, and within these he functions with joy and with sorrow.

So you see man throughout the world as a prisoner, imprisoned within the walls of his own creation, within the walls of his own making; and through these enclosures, through these walls of environment, through the limitation of his ideas, ambitions and aspirations—through these he is trying to function, sometimes successfully, and sometimes with hideous struggle. And the man who succeeds in making himself comfortable in the prison we call successful, whereas the man who succumbs in the prison we call a failure. But both success and failure are within the walls of the prison.

Now when you look at the world in that way you see man in that limitation, in that enclosure. And what is that man, what is that individuality? What is his environment, and what are his actions? That is what I want to talk about this morning.

First of all, what is individuality? When you say, "I am an individual," what do you mean by it? I think you mean by that—without giving subtle philosophical or metaphysical explanations—you mean by individuality, the consciousness of separation, and the expression of that separate consciousness which you call self-expression. That is, individuality is that full recognition, full consciousness of separate thought, separate emotion, limited and held in the bondage of environment; and the expression of that limited thought and of that limited feeling, which are the same essentially, he calls his self-expression. This self-expression of the individual, which is but the consciousness

of separation, is either forced and compelled by circumstances to take some particular channel of action; or, in spite of circumstances, expresses intelligence, which is creative living. That is, as an individual he has become conscious of his separative action, is compelled, forced, circumscribed, urged to function along some particular channel which he does not choose at all. Most people are forced into work, activities, vocations for which they are not at all suited. They spend the rest of their existence in battling against these circumstances and so waste all their energies in struggle, pain, suffering, and occasionally in pleasure. Or a man pierces through the limitations of environment because he understands its full significance, and lives intelligently, creatively, whether in the world of art, music, science, or of professions, without the sense of separation through expression.

This expression of creative intelligence is very rare, and though it has the appearance of individuality or separateness, to me it is not individuality but intelligence. Where there is true intelligence functioning, there is not the consciousness of individuality; but where there is frustration, effort and struggle against circumstances, there is the consciousness of individuality which is not intelligence.

The man who is functioning intelligently and who is therefore free of circumstances we call creative, divine. To a man who is in prison, the liberated man, the intelligent man is as a god. So we need not discuss that man who is free, because we are not concerned with him; the majority of people are not concerned with him, and I am not going to deal with that freedom because liberation, divinity, can be understood, realized, only when you have left the prison. You cannot understand divinity in prison. So it is utterly futile, merely metaphysical or philosophical, to discuss what is liberation, what is divinity, what is God; because what you can now discern as God must be limited, since your mind is circumscribed, held in bondage; therefore I will not describe that.

As long as this spontaneous, intelligent expression which we call life, which is that exquisite reality, is thwarted, there is merely the accentuation of the consciousness of the individual. The more you battle against environment without understanding, the more you struggle against circumstances, the more you become conscious, in that effort, of your limitation.

Please, do not suppose the opposite of that limited consciousness to be complete annihilation, or mechanical functioning, or group activity. I am showing you the cause of individuality, how individuality arises; but with the dissipation, the disappearance of that limited consciousness, it does not follow that you become mechanical, or that there will be

a collective functioning through the focus of a single dominating individual. Because intelligence is free of the particular which is the individual, as well as of the collective (for after all, the collective is but the multiplicity of individuals), and there is the disappearance of this limited consciousness which we call individuality, it does not follow that you become mechanical, collective; but rather that there is intelligence, and that intelligence is co-operative, not destructive, not individualistic or collective.

Every man then is thwarted, and conscious of his own separateness he functions and acts in and through environment, battling against it and making colossal efforts to adjust, modify and alter circumstances. Isn't this what you are all doing? You are thwarted in your love, in your vocation, in your actions; and in the struggle against your limitations you become acute in your consciousness, and you begin to modify and alter circumstances, environment. Then what happens? You merely increase the walls of resistance, for modification or alteration is but the result of the lack of understanding; when you understand you don't seek to modify, to alter, to reform.

So in modification, adjustment, alteration, in your efforts to break through the limitations, the walls, there is what you call activity. For the vast majority of people action is nothing but the modification of environment, and this action leads to the enlarging of the walls of prison, or the limitation of environment. If you don't understand something and merely try to modify it, your action must increase the barriers, must build up new sets of barriers; your efforts merely enlarge the prison. And these barriers, these walls man calls environment; and the functioning within them he calls action.

I wonder if I have explained this. Without understanding the significance of environment, man struggles to alter, modify that environment, and thereby but heightens the walls of his prison, though he thinks he has removed them. These walls are environment, ever changing, and action to him is but the modification of this environment.

So there is never a release, never a completeness, a richness in this action; there is but increasing fear, and never fulfillment. The multiplication of problems is the whole process of the existence of the individual, of yourself. You think you have solved one problem, and in its place there grows another, and so you continue to the very end of life, and when there is no problem at all, then you call that death. When there is no possibility of a further problem, naturally that to you is annihilation and death.

And again is not your affection, love, born of fear and hedged about by jealousy, suspicion, and oppressed by possessiveness and sorrow?

For this love is born out of the desire to possess, born of insufficiency, born of incompleteness. And thought is merely the reaction to limitation, to environment. Isn't it? When you say, "I think," "I feel," you are reacting to environment and not trying to pierce through that environment. But intelligence is the process of piercing through environment, not the reaction to environment. That is, when you say, "I think," you mean you have certain sets of ideas, beliefs, dogmas and creeds. And as an animal that is tethered to a post wanders within the length of its rope, so you wander within the limitation of these beliefs, dogmas and creeds. Surely that is not thinking. That is merely having reactions to bondage, to beliefs, dogmas and creeds; these reactions produce an effort, a conflict, and that conflict you call thinking, but it is merely like walking round and round within the walls of a prison. Your action is but reaction to this prison, producing further fear, further limitation; isn't that so?

When we talk about action what do we mean? Movement within the limitation of environment, that movement confined to a fixed idea, a fixed prejudice, a fixed belief, dogma or creed; such movement within that limitation you call action. So the more you act, the less intelligent and free you become, because you have always this fixed point of safety, of security, this dogma or creed; and as you begin to act from that, naturally you are only creating further limitations, further walls of restriction. Then your action is not creative, your action is not born of intelligence, which is completeness itself. Therefore there is no joy, no ecstasy, no fullness of life, no love.

So, not having that creative intelligence which is the comprehension of environment, man begins to play within the walls of his prison, he begins to embellish and decorate the prison and he makes himself comfortable within its walls; and he thinks and hopes to bring beauty into that ugly prison. Therefore he begins to reform, he searches out societies which talk about brotherhood, but which are also within the prison; he tries to become free while remaining possessive. So this beautifying, reforming, playing, seeking comfort within the walls of that prison, he calls living, functioning, acting. And as there is no intelligence, no creative ecstasy of living, he must ever be crushed down by the false structure which he has raised. Thus he begins to resign himself to the prison because he sees he cannot alter, he cannot break down these limitations; because he has not the desire or the intensity of suffering which demands the breaking down of that prison, he resigns himself to it and takes flight into romanticism or escapes through the glorification of his own self. Now this glorification of his own self he calls religion, spiritualism, occultism, either scientific or spurious.

Isn't that what each one does? Please, is this not applicable to you? Don't say this applies to the individual whom we are observing from the top of the world. This individual is yourself, your neighbour, every one of you. So as I talk of these things, don't look at your neighbour or think of some distant friend, which is but an immediate escape. Rather, as I am talking, let the mirror of intelligence be created in front of you, so that you can see the picture of yourself, without a twist, without bias, and with clarity. Out of that clarity will be born action, not lethargic thought or the mere modification of environment.

Again, if you are not imaginative or romantic, if you do not seek what is called God or religion, you create about you a whirlpool of bustle, you become inventors of schemes, you begin to reform your environment, to alter your prison walls, and you increase further the activities in that prison.

You begin, if you are not imaginative or romantic or mystic, to create greater and greater activity within that prison, calling yourselves reformers, and so create greater and greater limitation, restriction and chaos in the prison. Hence you have unnatural divisions called religions and nationalities, caused or created by exploiters and perpetuated for their own profession and benefit.

Now what is religion? What is the function of religion as it is? Don't imagine some marvellous, true and perfect religion; we are discussing what exists, not what should exist. What is this religion to which man has become a slave, to which he has succumbed unintelligently, hopelessly, to be slaughtered on the altar by the exploiter? How has it been created? It is the individual who has created it through the desire for his own security, which naturally creates fear. When you begin the search for your own security through what you call spirituality, which is spurious, you must have fear. When mind seeks security, what does it expect? To be assured of a condition in which it can be at ease, a point of certainty from which it can think and act, and to live perpetually in that condition. But a mind that seeks certainty is never assured. It is the mind that does not seek certainty that can become assured. It is the mind which has no fear, which sees the futility of an aim, of a culmination, of an achievement, that lives intelligently, therefore with surety, and so is immortal.

Thus the search for security must create fear, and from fear is born the desire for creeds and beliefs in order to ward off that fear. With your beliefs, your creeds, dogmas and authorities, you push fear into the background. To ward off fear you seek guides, masters, systems, because you hope that by following them, by obeying them, by

ing them you will have peace, you will have comfort. They are the tricksters who become priests, exploiters, preachers, mediators, swamis and yogis.

Don't nod your head in approval, because you are all in this chaos. You are all caught up in it. You can only nod your head in approval when you are free of it. In listening to me and nodding your head you show mere intellectual approval of an idea which I am expressing. And what value has that?

Where there is the craving for security there must be fear, so mind and heart seek out spiritual trainers to learn from them ways of escape. As in a circus the animals are trained to function for the amusement of spectators, so the individual through fear seeks out these spiritual trainers whom he calls priests and swamis, who are the defenders of spurious spirituality and the inanities of religion. Naturally the function of spiritual trainers is to create amusements for you, and so they invent ceremonies, disciplines and worship; all these pretend to be beautiful in expression, but degenerate into superstition. This is but knavery under the cloak of service.

Discipline is merely a form of adjustment to an environment of a different kind, and yet the battle continues constantly within you even though through discipline you are stifling that creative intelligence. And worship, which in reality is most lovely, which is affection, love itself, becomes objectified, exploited, worthless, without any significance or value.

Naturally out of all this fear is born the search for security, the search for God or truth. Can you ever find God? Can you ever find truth? But truth exists; God is. You cannot find truth, you cannot find God, because your search is but an escape from fear, your search is but a desire for a culmination. Therefore when you seek out God, you are merely seeking a comfortable resting place. Surely that is not God, that is not truth; that is merely a place, an abode of stagnation from which all intelligence is banished, in which all creative life is extinct. To me the very search for God or truth is the very denial of it. The mind that is not seeking a culmination, a goal, an end, shall discover truth. Then divinity is not an externalized, unfulfilled desire, but that intelligence which is itself God, which is beauty, truth, completeness.

As I said, we have created unnatural divisions which we call religions and social organizations for human life. After all, these social organizations are essentially based on our needs, our needs of shelter, food and sex. The whole structure of our civilization is based on that. But this structure has become so monstrous, and we have glorified our needs

so fearfully that our needs for shelter, food and sex, which are simple, natural and clean, have become complicated and made hideous, cruel, appalling, by this colossal and ever-crumbling structure which we call society, and which man has created.

After all, to discover our needs in their simplicity, in their naturalness, in their cleanliness, in their spontaneity, demands tremendous intelligence. The man who has discovered his needs is no longer caught by environment.

But because there is so much exploitation, so much unintelligence, so much ruthlessness in glorifying these needs, this structure which we call nationalism, economic independence, political and social organizations, class divisions, prestige of peoples and their racial cultures—this structure exists for the exploitation of man by man and leads him to conflict, disharmony, war and destruction. After all, this is the purpose of all class distinctions, this is the function of all nationalities, sovereign governments, racial prejudices, this utter spoliation and exploitation of man by man, leading to war.

Now this is how things are, this whole structure, the creation of our human mind which we have individually built up. These monstrous, cruel, appalling social and religious distinctions, dividing, separating, disuniting human beings, have created havoc in the world. You as individuals have created them; they haven't come into being naturally, mysteriously, spontaneously. Some miraculous god has not created them. It is the individual who has created them, and you alone as individuals can destroy them. If we wait for some other monstrous system to come into being to create a new condition for you to live in, then you will become only a slave again to that new condition. In that there can be no intelligence, no spontaneous, creative living.

As an individual you must begin to perceive the true significance of environment, whether it is of the past or of the present, that is, perceive the true significance of continually changing circumstances; and in the perception of that which is true in environment, there must be great conflict. But you do not desire conflict, you want reforms, you want *someone to reform the environment*. As most people are in conflict and try to escape from that conflict by seeking a solution, which can be but a modification of environment, as most people are caught up in conflict, I say: Become intensely conscious of that conflict, don't try to escape it, don't try to seek out solutions for it. Then in that acuteness of suffering you will discern the true significance of environment. In that clarity of thought there is no deception, no security, no withholding, and no limitation.

This is intelligence, and this intelligence is pure action. When action is born of that intelligence, when action is itself intelligence, then you do not seek that intelligence or buy it through action. There is then completeness, sufficiency, richness, the realization of that eternity which is God. And that completeness, that intelligence prevents forever the creation of barriers and prisons.

June 21, 1934

Eighth Talk in The Oak Grove

This morning I am going to answer some of the many questions which have been sent to me.

Question: Do I understand you to mean that the ego, made from the effects of environment, is the visible shell, surrounding a unique and immortal nut? Does that nut grow or shrivel or change?

Krishnamurti: You know some of you bring the spirit of speculation, the spirit of gambling into your inquiry as to what is truth. Just as you speculate in the stock market to get rich quickly, and thus exploit others, cheat others, through this pernicious habit of gambling, so does a philosophical mind indulge in its habit of speculation. With that attitude of mind you begin to inquire if there is an immortal and enduring soul, entity or being which is complete in itself, or an ever increasing, growing, expanding individuality.

Now why do you want to know? What lies behind this inquiry, this spirit of speculation? Wouldn't it be better not to inquire, not to speculate, but rather to ascertain if the environment creates that conflict resulting in that individual consciousness, of which I spoke yesterday? Would that not be better than merely to speculate, because all speculation about these matters must be utterly false, since one cannot possibly conceive, in that state of limitation, in that state of conflict between the result of environment and environment itself, one cannot conceive that reality, that eternal life which is truth. If you say that it is consciousness ever increasing, ever expanding, or that it is complete in itself, eternal, I think it is incorrect, because it is neither of these two things from the point of view of that which is intelligence. If you are merely speculating to discover whether that being grows, or eternally is, then the result will be a pattern, a metaphysical or philosophical concept according to which you will, consciously or unconsciously, mould your lives. Therefore such a pattern will be merely an escape, an escape from that conflict which alone can free man from his speculation, from his gambling.

So if you become conscious of the conflict, then you will see in its intensity the meaning of eternity; that is, when you begin to free the

mind and heart from all conflict there is intelligence, and then timelessness has a different significance altogether. It is a fulfillment, not a growth. It is ever becoming, not towards an end, but inherently. You can understand this intellectually, superficially, but you cannot understand it fundamentally in all its depth, richness, if the mind and heart are merely seeking a metaphysical refuge, or taking delight in philosophical speculations.

Question: If the eternal is intelligence and therefore truth, then it is not bothered by the false which is the "I" and the environment. Similarly, there is no inducement to the false, the "I", the environment, to be troubled about the eternal, truth, intelligence; for, as you have said repeatedly, the one cannot be reached by the other, no matter how great is the effort. And it also appears that throughout the thousands of years of human life, the eternal has not made much headway in dissipating the false and creating truth. As they seem to be unrelated according to you, why not let the eternal be the eternal, and let the false get worse if it pleases? In a word, why bother about anything at all?

Krishnamurti: Why bother about it? Why do you bother about anything in life? Because there is conflict, because man is caught in sorrow, in pain, transient joys, innumerable struggles, vain gropings, subtle fancies and romanticisms which are always collapsing; because there is continual strife in the mind, you begin to inquire why this struggle exists. If there is not a struggle, why bother about it? I quite agree with the questioner, why bother about anything if there is not this struggle, the struggle of earning money and keeping that money, the struggle of adjusting yourself to your neighbours, environment and conditions and demands, the struggle to be yourself, to express what you feel. If you don't feel that there is a struggle, then don't bother, let it alone. But I do not think there is a single human being in the world—except perhaps the savages in remote places away from civilization—who is not in the struggle, in the ceaseless search for security, for comfort, driven by fear. In that struggle man begins to create ideas concerning truth as ways of escape.

I say there is a mode of life in which conflict ceases altogether, a way to live spontaneously, naturally, ecstatically. This to me is a fact, not a theory. And I would like to help those who are in sorrow, who are not seeking an end, who are trying to discover the cause of this

into my thoughts and I dwell on them pleasantly for a moment, is this what you decri as not living fully in the present?

Krishnamurti: What is living fully in the present? I will try again to explain what I mean. A mind that is in conflict, in struggle, is continually seeking an escape; either the memory of the past unconsciously precipitates itself in the mind; or the mind deliberately turns back into the past and lives in the delight of that past, which is one form of escape. Or else the mind in conflict, in struggle, which is without understanding, seeks a future, a future that you call a belief, a goal, a culmination, an achievement, a success, and escapes to that. It is the function of memory to be cunning and to escape from the present. This process of looking back is but one of the tricks of memory which you call self-analysis, which but perpetuates memory, and therefore limits and confines the mind, banishing intelligence.

So there are these various forms of escape, and when mind has ceased to escape through memory, when memory no longer clouds the mind and heart, there is then that ecstasy of living in the present. This can only be when mind is no longer taking delight in the past or the future, when mind does not create division; in other words, when that supreme intelligence which is truth, which is beauty, which is love itself, is functioning normally, without effort—then in that state intelligence is timeless, and then there is not this fear of not living in the present.

Question: When love is freed of all possessiveness, does this not necessarily result in asceticism and hence abnormality?

Krishnamurti: If you were free of possessiveness, you would not ask this question. Before you have come to that immense thing, you are already afraid, and are therefore building a protective wall which you call asceticism. So let us consider first, not whether it will be asceticism and therefore abnormality, when you are free of possessiveness, but whether that possessiveness itself creates the struggle and produces the abnormal.

Why is there this idea of possession? Is it not born out of insufficiency, out of incompleteness? And because of that insufficiency, sex and other problems assume great importance, and hence possessiveness plays a tremendous part in the lives of people. In completeness, which is intelligence itself, there is no abnormality. But being insufficient,

incomplete, knowing poverty, emptiness, utter loneliness and shallowness of thought and emotion, we depend on other people, on books, on literature, on ideas, on philosophy to enrich our lives, and thus we begin to acquire, store up. This process of storing up for guidance in the present is but the functioning of memory which depends on knowledge which is of the past and therefore dead.

As a man of many possessions looks for comfort in his things, so the man of poverty, of shallowness, of incompleteness, looks to the possession of his friend, of his wife or of his love; and out of this possessiveness comes the battle and the constant gnawings of mind and heart. And when there is freedom from these conflicts, which can come only through awareness, through the understanding of environment, and not through effort—when there is this freedom, this understanding, then there is no possessiveness and hence there is no abnormality. After all, the ascetic is one who eschews life because he does not understand it. He runs away from life, from life with all its expressions; whereas intelligence does not seek to escape from anything, because there is nothing to be put away; intelligence is complete, and in that completeness there is no division.

Question: If priests are exploiters, why did Christ found the apostolic succession and Buddha his sangha?

Krishnamurti: First of all, how do you know? You have been told, you have read of it in books. How do you know they are not the fabrications of priests for their own profession, for their own benefit? An authority seasoned through the mists of time becomes invulnerable, and then man accepts that authority as being final. Why accept the Christ or the Buddha, or anyone, including myself? Let us rather ascertain whether priests are exploiters, not merely accept that they are not, simply because Christ is supposed to have established the apostolic succession. That is only the habit of a lazy mind that wants to settle everything by authority, by precedent, saying that because someone has said it, therefore it must be true, it does not matter whether that someone is great or small.

So let us find out. As I tried to explain yesterday, religions are the outcome of man's search for security. And therefore when a mind is seeking shelter, certainty, a place where it can rest, an assurance of immortality, when a mind seeks these, then there must be those to comfort and satisfy that mind. You may call them priests, exploi

mediators, swamis; all these are of the same type. Now when you are seeking shelter, there is always the fear of losing it; when you are seeking gain, naturally with it comes the fear of loss. So the fear of loss drives you continually to this search for security, which to me is utterly false. And therefore a false cause creates a false product; and this product is the priest, the swami, the exploiter.

Why do you want a priest at all? As a convenient person for marrying you or burying you, or to give you a blessing which will wash away all your so-called sins? There is no such thing as sin—there is only the lack of understanding, and that lack of understanding cannot be washed away by any priest, whether he claims apostolic succession or not. Intelligence alone can free you from that lack of understanding, not the benedictions of a priest, or going to an altar or to the grave.

Do you go to a priest because he will awaken your intelligence, give you stimulation? Then treat this as you treat drink. If you are addicted to drink, it is a pity, because all dependence reveals a lack of intelligence, and then there must be suffering. And man is caught up in this suffering continually, although he does not and will not see the cause; he therefore multiplies means and ways of escape. But the cause is the very search for security, for this certainty which does not exist.

The mind which is intelligent seeks no security, because there is no place, no abode where it can rest. Intelligence itself is tranquillity, creativeness, and as long as there is not that intelligence there must be suffering. Running away from the cause of suffering is not going to give you that intelligence; on the contrary, it makes you more blind more ignorant; and more and more you will suffer. What gives you perception immediately, directly, is that full intensity of awareness in the present. To understand the environment, whatever it be, is intelligence. Then you are really beyond all priests, then you are beyond all limitations, beyond the gods themselves.

Question: You refer to two forms of action: reaction to environment, which creates conflict, and penetration of environment, which brings freedom from conflict. I understand the first, but not the second. What do you mean by the penetration of environment?

Krishnamurti: There is the reaction to environment when the mind does not understand the environment, and acts without understanding.

thereby further increasing the limitation of environment. That is one form of action in which most people are caught up. You react to one environment which creates a conflict, and to escape from that conflict you create another environment which you hope will bring you peace, which is but acting in environment without understanding that the environment may change. That is one form of action.

Then there is the other which is to understand environment and to act, which does not mean that you understand first and then act, but the very understanding itself is action; that is, it is without the calculation, modification, adjustment, which are the functions of memory. You see environment as it is, with all its significance, in the mirror of intelligence, and in that spontaneity of action there is freedom. After all, what is freedom? To move so that there are no barriers, to leave no barriers behind, or create them as you go along. Now the creation of barriers, the creation of environment is the function of memory, which is self-consciousness, which divides mind from intelligence. To put it again differently: action between two false things, the environment and the result of environment, action between these must ever create, must ever increase barriers and therefore diminish, banish intelligence. Whereas, if you recognize this—recognition is not a matter of intellect, recognition must be born of your complete being—then in that full awareness there takes place a different action, which is not burdened by memory—and I have explained what I mean by memory. Therefore every movement of thought and emotion takes a different nuance, a different significance. Then intelligence is not a division between the object which is environment and the creator which you call the self. Then intelligence does not divide, and therefore is itself the spontaneity of action.

June 25, 1934

sive, nationalistic and class conscious, and yet divide that separative consciousness from your spiritual consciousness in which you try to be brotherly, follow ethics, morality and try to realize God. In other words, you have divided life into various compartments and each compartment has its own special values, and you thereby only create further conflict.

This division, this reliance on experts, is nothing else but the laziness of the mind, so that it need not think, but merely conform. Conformity, which is but the creation and destruction of values, is environment to which mind is constantly adjusting itself, and so mind becomes increasingly bound and enslaved. But conformity must exist so long as mind is bound by environment. So long as mind has not understood the significance of environment, circumstances, conditions, there must be conformity. Tradition is but the mould for the mind, and a mind that imagines itself free from tradition merely creates its own mould. A man who says, "I am free of tradition," has probably another mould of his own to which he is a slave.

So freedom is not in going from an old mould into a new one, from an old stupidity into a new stupidity, or from restraint of tradition to the license of mindlessness, of lack of mind. And yet you will observe that those people who talk a great deal about freedom, liberation, are doing that; that is, they have put away their old tradition and have now a pattern of their own to which they conform, and naturally this conformity is but mindlessness, the absence of intelligence. What you call tradition is merely outer environment with its values, and what you call freedom from tradition is but enslavement to some inner environment and its values. One is imposed, and the other self-created; isn't it? That is, circumstances, environment, conditions, are imposing certain values and making you conform to those values, or you develop your own values to which you are again conforming. In both cases there is merely adjustment, not comprehension of environment. From this there arises, naturally, the question whether mind can ever discover lasting values, so that there will not be this constant change, this constant conflict created by values which one has established for oneself, or which have been imposed on one externally.

What is it that we call changing values? To me these changing values are but cultivated fears. There must be the change of values so long as there are essentials and unessentials, so long as there are opposites, and the whole idea and the great worship of success, in which we include gain and loss and achievement—as long as these exist and the mind is pursuing these as its aim, its goal, there must be the changing of values, and therefore conflict.

Now what is it that creates the changing of values? Mind which is also heart, is befogged and clouded by memory, and is ever undergoing a change, modifying or altering itself, is depending ever on the movement of circumstances, the lack of understanding of which creates memory. That is, as long as mind is clouded by memory, which is the outcome of adjustment to environment, and not the understanding of environment, that memory must come between intelligence and environment, and therefore there cannot be the full comprehension of environment.

This memory, which you call mind, is giving and imparting values, isn't it? That is the whole function of memory, which you call mind. That is, mind, instead of being itself intelligence which is direct perception, mind clouded by memory is giving values as true and false, essential and unessential, according to its cunning, according to its calculating fears and its search for security. Isn't that so? That is the whole function of memory, which you call the mind, but which is not mind at all. To the majority of people, except perhaps here and there to one rare, happy person, mind is merely a machine, a store-house of memory which is continually giving values to the things it meets, to experiences. And the imparting of values depends on its subtle calculations, cunning and deceitfulness, based on fear and the search for security.

Though there is no such thing as fundamental security—it is obvious, the moment you begin to think, observe awhile, that there is no such thing as security—memory seeks security after security, certainty after certainty, essential after essential, achievement after achievement. As the mind is constantly seeking security, the moment it has that security, it regards as unessential what it has left behind. Again, it is only imparting values, and thus in this process of movement from goal to goal, from essential to essential, in the process of this constant movement, its values are changing, always coloured by its own security and anxiety for its perpetuation.

So mind-heart, or memory, is caught up in the struggle of changing values, and this battle is called progress, the evolutionary path of choice leading to truth. That is, mind, seeking security and reaching its goal, is not satisfied with it, therefore again moves on and again begins to give new values to all things in its path. This process of movement you call growth, the evolutionary path of choice between the essential and the unessentials.

· This growth is to me nothing else but memory conforming and adjusting itself to its own creation which is the environment; and fundamentally there is no difference between that memory and the

environment. Naturally, action is always the result of calculation when it is born of this conformity and adjustment. Isn't it? When mind is clouded over by memory, which is but the result of the lack of understanding of environment, such a mind, befogged by memory, must in its action seek an escape, a culmination, a motive, and therefore that action is never free, it is always limited, and is always creating further bondages, further conflict. So this vicious circle of memory, burdened by its conflict, becomes the creator of values. Values are environment, and mind and heart become its slaves.

I wonder if you have understood all this. No, I see someone shaking his head. Let me put the same idea differently and perhaps make it clear, if I can.

As long as mind does not understand environment, that environment must create memory, and the movement of memory is the changing of values. Memory must exist so long as the mind is seeking a culmination, a goal; and its action must ever be calculated, can never be spontaneous—by action I mean thought and emotion—and therefore that action must ever lead to greater and greater burdens, greater and greater limitation. The growth of this limitation, the extension of this prison, is called evolution, the path of choice towards truth. That is how mind functions for most people, and so the more it functions, the greater becomes the suffering, the greater the intensity of struggle. The mind creates ever new and greater barriers, and then seeks further escapes from that conflict.

So how is one to free the mind from giving values at all? When the mind imparts values, it can only impart them through the fog of memory, and therefore cannot understand the full significance of environment. If I examine or try to understand circumstances through the various deep-rooted prejudices—national, racial, social or religious prejudices—how can I understand environment? Yet that is what mind attempts, the mind which is befogged by memory.

Now intelligence imparts no values, which are but the measures, standards or calculations, born out of self-protectiveness. So how is there to be this intelligence, this mirror of truth, in which there are only absolute reflections and no perversions? After all, the intelligent man is the summation of intelligence; his is an absolute, direct perception without twists and perversions which result when memory functions.

What I am saying can only apply to those who are really in conflict, not to those who want to reform, who want to do patchwork. I have explained what I mean by reform, by patchwork—it is an adjustment to an environment, born out of the lack of understanding.

How is one to have this intelligence which destroys struggle and conflict and the ceaseless effort which wears out mind itself? You know, when you make an effort, you are as a piece of wood that is being whittled away continually until there is no wood left at all. So if there is this continual effort, this constant wear, mind ceases to be itself; and effort only exists so long as there is conformity or adjustment to environment. Whereas if there is immediate perception, immediate, spontaneous understanding of environment, there is no effort to adjust oneself. There is an immediate action.

So how is one to awaken this intelligence? Now, what happens in moments of great crisis? In that rich moment when memory is not escaping, in that acute, intense awareness of the circumstance, of the environment, there is the perception of what is true. You do this in moments of crisis. You are fully conscious of all circumstances, of the condition about you, and also you are aware that mind cannot escape. In that intensity which is not relative, in that intensity of acute crisis, intelligence is functioning and there is spontaneous understanding.

After all, what is it that we call a crisis, a sorrow? When the mind is lethargic, when it has gone to sleep, when it has conditioned itself in contentment, in stagnation, there comes an experience to awaken you, and that awakening, that shock, you call crisis, sorrow. Now if that crisis or conflict is really intense, then you will see in that state of acuteness of mind and heart, that there is an immediate perception. That intensity becomes relative only when memory comes in with its calculations, modifications, and clouds.

Please, I hope you will experiment with what I am saying. Each one has moments of crisis. They occur very often; if one is aware they occur every minute. Now in that crisis, in that conflict, observe, without the desire for a solution, without the desire for escape, without the desire to overcome it. Then you will see that mind has understood instantaneously the cause of conflict, and in understanding the cause, there is the dissolution of the cause. But we have so trained the mind to escape, to let memory cloud the mind, that it is very difficult to become intensely aware. Hence we seek means and ways of escape or of awakening that intelligence, which to me is again false. Intelligence functions spontaneously if the mind ceases to escape, ceases to seek solutions.

So when the mind is not imparting values, which is mere conformity, when there is spontaneous understanding of the prison, which is environment, then there is the action of intelligence, which is freedom.

As long as the mind, clouded by memory, imparts values, action must

create further walls of prison; but in the spontaneous understanding of the walls of the prison, which is environment, in that understanding there is the action of intelligence, which is freedom; because that action, that intelligence, is not creating or imparting values. Values must exist—values which are circumstances and therefore bondage, conformity to environment—these values of conformity, of circumstances, must exist so long as there is fear, which is born of the search for security. And when the mind, which is intelligence, sees the full significance of environment and therefore understands environment, there is spontaneous action which is intelligence itself, and therefore that intelligence is not imparting values, but is completely understanding the circumstances in which it exists.

June 28, 1934

religious, sex. That is, when the mind is trying to overcome, it must create duality, and that very duality negates understanding, and creates the distinctions which we call class, religion, sex. That duality influences the mind, and hence a mind influenced by duality cannot understand the significance of environment or the significance of the cause of conflict. These psychological influences are merely reactions to environment from that center of "I" consciousness, of like and dislike, of antitheses, and naturally where there are antitheses, opposites, there can be no comprehension. From this distinction there arises the classification of influences as beneficial and evil. So as long as mind is influenced—and influence is born of attraction, opposites, antitheses—there must be the domination or compulsion of love, of intellect, of society, and this influence must be a hindrance to that understanding which is beauty, truth and love itself.

Now if you can become aware of this influence, then you can discern its cause. Most people seem to be aware superficially, not at the greatest depth. It is only when there is awareness at the greatest depth of consciousness, of thought and emotion, that you can discern the division that is created through influence, which negates understanding.

Question: After listening to your talk about memory, I have completely lost mine, and I find I cannot remember my huge debts. I feel blissful. Is this liberation?

Krishnamurti: Ask the person to whom you owe the money. I am afraid that there is some confusion with regard to what I have been trying to say concerning memory. If you rely on memory as a guide to conduct, as a means of activity in life, then that memory must impede your action, your conduct, because then that action or conduct is merely the result of calculation, and therefore it has no spontaneity no richness, no fullness of life. It does not mean that you must forge your debts. You cannot forget the past. You cannot blot it out of your mind. That is an impossibility. Subconsciously it will exist, but if that subconscious, dormant memory is influencing you unconsciously, is moulding your action, your conduct, your whole outlook on life, then that influence must ever be creating further limitations, imposing further burdens on the functioning of intelligence.

For example, I have recently come from India; I have been to Australia and New Zealand where I met various people, had many ideas

and saw many sights. I can't forget these, though the memory of them may fade. But the reaction to the past may impede my full comprehension in the present, it may hinder the intelligent functioning of my mind. That is, if my experiences and remembrances of the past are becoming hindrances in the present through their reaction, then I cannot comprehend or live fully, intensely, in the present.

You react to the past because the present has lost its significance, or because you want to avoid the present; so you go back to the past and live in that emotional thrill, in that reaction of surging memory, because the present has little value. So when you say, "I have completely lost my memory," I am afraid you are fit for only one place. You cannot lose memory, but by living completely in the present, in the fullness of the moment, you become conscious of all the subconscious entanglements of memory, the dormant hopes and longings which surge forward and prevent you from functioning intelligently in the present. If you are aware of that, if you are aware of that hindrance, aware of it at its depth, not superficially, then the dormant subconscious memory, which is but the lack of understanding and incompleteness of living, disappears, and therefore you meet each movement of environment, each swiftness of thought anew.

Question: You say that the complete understanding of the outer and inner environment of the individual releases him from bondage and sorrow. Now, even in that state, how can one free himself from the indescribable sorrow which in the nature of things is caused by the death of someone he really loves?

Krishnamurti: What is the cause of suffering in this case? And what is it that we call suffering? Isn't suffering merely a shock to the mind to awaken it to its own insufficiency? The recognition of that insufficiency creates what we call sorrow. Suppose that you have been relying on your son or your husband or your wife to satisfy that insufficiency, that incompleteness; by the loss of that person whom you love, there is created the full consciousness of that emptiness, of that void, and out of that consciousness comes sorrow, and you say, "I have lost somebody."

So through death there is, first of all, the full consciousness of emptiness, which you have been carefully evading. Hence where there is dependence there must be emptiness, shallowness, insufficiency, and therefore sorrow and pain. We don't want to recognize that; we don't

see that that is the fundamental cause. So we begin to say, "I miss my friend, my husband, my wife, my child. How am I to overcome this loss? How am I to overcome this sorrow?"

Now all overcoming is but substitution. In that there is no understanding and therefore there can only be further sorrow, though momentarily you may find a substitution that will completely put the mind to sleep. If you don't seek an overcoming, then you turn to séances, mediums, or take shelter in the scientific proof that life continues after death. So you begin to discover various means of escape and substitution, which momentarily relieve you from suffering. Whereas, if there were the cessation of this desire to overcome and if there were really the desire to understand, to find out, fundamentally, what causes pain and sorrow, then you would discover that so long as there is loneliness, shallowness, emptiness, insufficiency, which in its outer expression is dependence, there must be pain. And you cannot fill that insufficiency by overcoming obstacles, by substitutions, by escaping or by accumulating, which is merely the cunning of the mind lost in the pursuit of gain.

Suffering is merely that high, intense clarity of thought and emotion which forces you to recognize things as they are. But this does not mean acceptance, resignation. When you see things as they are in the mirror of truth, which is intelligence, then there is a joy, an ecstasy; in that there is no duality, no sense of loss, no division. I assure you this is not theoretical. If you consider what I am now saying, with my answer to the first question about memory, you will see how memory creates greater and greater dependence, the continual looking back to an event emotionally, to get a reaction from it, which prevents the full expression of intelligence in the present.

Question: What suggestion or advice would you give to one who is hindered by strong sexual desire?

Krishnamurti: After all, where there is no creative expression of life, we give undue importance to sex, which becomes an acute problem. So the question is not what advice or suggestion I would give, or how one can overcome passion, sexual desire, but how to release that creative living, and not merely tackle one part of it, which is sex; that is, how to understand the wholeness, the completeness of life.

Now, through modern education, through circumstances and environment, you are driven to do something which you hate. You are

repelled, but you are forced to do it because of your lack of proper equipment, proper training. In your work you are being prevented by circumstances, by conditions, from expressing yourself fundamentally, creatively, and so there must be an outlet; and this outlet becomes the sex problem or the drink problem or some idiotic, inane problem. All these outlets become problems.

Or you are artistically inclined. There are very few artists, but you may be inclined, and that inclination is continually being perverted, twisted, thwarted, so that you have no means of real self-expression, and thus undue importance comes to be given either to sex or to some religious mania. Or your ambitions are thwarted, curtailed, hindered, and so again undue importance is given to those things that should be normal. So, until you understand comprehensively your religious, political, economic and social desires, and their hindrances, the natural functions of life will take an immense importance, and the first place in your life. Hence all the innumerable problems of greed, of possessiveness, of sex, of social and racial distinctions have their false measure and false value. But if you were to deal with life, not in parts but as a whole, comprehensively, creatively, with intelligence, then you would see that these problems, which are enervating the mind and destroying creative living, disappear, and then intelligence functions normally, and in that there is an ecstasy.

Question: I have been under the impression that I have been putting your ideas into action; but I have no joy in life, no enthusiasm for any pursuit. My attempts at awareness have not cleared my confusion, nor have they brought any change or vitality into my life. My living has no more meaning for me now than it had when I started to listen to you seven years ago. What is wrong with me?

Krishnamurti: I wonder if the questioner has, first of all, understood what I have been saying before trying to put my ideas into action. And why should he put my ideas into action? And what are my ideas? And why are they my ideas? I am not giving you a mould or a code by which you can live, or a system which you can follow. All that I am saying is, that to live creatively, enthusiastically, intelligently, vitally, intelligence must function. That intelligence is perverted, hindered, by what one calls memory, and I have explained what I mean by that, so I won't go into it again. So long as there is this constant battle to achieve, so long as mind is influenced, there must be duality

flower blossoms forth of a morning. so intelligence happens, is there, functioning, creating comprehension.

Question: The artist is sometimes mentioned as one who has this understanding of which you speak, at least while working creatively. But if someone disturbs or crosses him, he may react violently, excusing his reaction as a manifestation of temperament. Obviously he is not living completely at the moment. Does he really understand if he so easily slips back into self-consciousness?

Krishnamurti: Who is the person that you call an artist? A man who is momentarily creative? To me he is not an artist. The man who merely at rare moments has this creative impulse and expresses that creativeness through perfection of technique, surely you would not call him an artist. To me, the true artist is one who lives completely, harmoniously, who does not divide his art from living, whose very life is that expression, whether it be a picture, music, or his behaviour; who has not divorced his expression on a canvas or in music or in stone from his daily conduct, daily living. That demands the highest intelligence, highest harmony. To me the true artist is the man who has that harmony. He may express it on canvas, or he may talk, or he may paint; or he may not express it at all, he may feel it. But all this demands that exquisite poise, that intensity of awareness, and therefore his expression is not divorced from the daily continuity of living.

June 29, 1931

Eleventh Talk in the Oak Grove

What we call happiness or ecstasy is to me creative thinking. And creative thinking is the infinite movement of thought, emotion and action. That is, when thought, which is emotion, which is action itself, is unimpeded in its movement, is not compelled or influenced or bound by an idea, and does not proceed from the background of tradition or habit, then that movement is creative. So long as thought—and I won't repeat each time emotion and action—so long as thought is circumscribed, held by a fixed idea, or merely adjusts itself to a background or condition and therefore becomes limited, such thought is not creative.

So the question which every thoughtful person puts to himself is how can he awaken this creative thinking; because when there is this creative thinking, which is infinite movement, then there can be no idea of a limitation, a conflict.

Now this movement of creative thinking does not seek in its expression a result, an achievement; its results and expressions are not its culmination. It has no culmination or goal, for it is eternally in movement. Most minds are seeking a culmination, a goal, an achievement, and are moulding themselves upon the idea of success, and such thought, such thinking is continually limiting itself. Whereas if there is no idea of achievement but only the continual movement of thought as understanding, as intelligence, then that movement of thought is creative. That is, creative thinking ceases when mind is crippled by adjustment through influence, or when it functions with the background of a tradition which it has not understood, or from a fixed point, like an animal tied to a post. So long as this limitation, adjustment exists, there cannot be creative thinking, intelligence, which alone is freedom.

This creative movement of thought never seeks a result or comes to a culmination, because result or culmination is always the outcome of alternate cessation and movement, whereas if there is no search for a result, but only continual movement of thought, then that is creative thinking. Again, creative thinking is free of division which creates conflict between thought, emotion and action. And division exists only when there is the search for a goal, when there is adjustment and the complacency of certainty.

Action is this movement which is itself thought and emotion, as I explained. This action is the relationship between the individual and society. It is conduct, work, co-operation, which we call fulfillment.

That is, when mind is functioning without seeking a culmination, a goal, and therefore thinking creatively, that thinking is action, which is the relationship between the individual and society. Now if this movement of thought is clear, simple, direct, spontaneous, profound, then there is no conflict in the individual against society, for action then is the very expression of this living, creative movement.

So to me there is no art of thinking, there is only creative thinking. There is no technique of thinking, but only spontaneous creative functioning of intelligence, which is the harmony of reason, emotion and action, not divided or divorced from each other.

Now this thinking and feeling, without a search for a reward, a result, *is true experiment, isn't it? In real experiencing, real experimenting,* there cannot be the search for result, because this experimenting is the movement of creative thought. To experiment, mind must be continually freeing itself from the environment with which it conflicts in its movement, the environment which we call the past. There can be no creative thinking *if mind is hindered by the search for a reward, by the pursuit of a goal.*

When the mind and heart are seeking a result or a gain, thereby complacency and stagnation, there must be practice, an overcoming, a discipline, out of which comes conflict. Most people think that by practicing a certain idea, they will release creative thinking. Now, practice, if you come to observe it, ponder over it, is nothing but the result of duality. And an action born of this duality must perpetuate that distinction between mind and heart, and such action becomes merely the expression of a calculated, logical, self-protective conclusion. If there is this practice of self-discipline, or this continual domination or influence by circumstances, then practice is merely an alteration, a change towards an end; it is merely action within the confines of the limited thought which you call *self-consciousness*. So practice does not bring about creative thinking.

To think creatively is to bring about harmony between mind, emotion and action. That is, if you are convinced of an action, without the search of a reward at the end, then that action, being the result of intelligence, releases all hindrances that have been placed on the mind through the lack of understanding.

I am afraid you are not getting this. When I put forward a new idea for the first time, and you are not accustomed to it, naturally you find it very difficult to understand; but if you will think over it, you will see its significance.

Where the mind and heart are held by fear, by lack of understanding, by compulsion, such a mind, though it can think within the

confines, within the limitations of that fear, is not really thinking, and its action must ever throw up new barriers. Therefore its capacity to think is ever being limited. But if the mind frees itself through the understanding of circumstances, and therefore acts, then that very action is creative thinking.

Question: Will you please give an example of the practical exercise of constant awareness and choice in everyday life.

Krishnamurti: Would you ask that question if there were a poisonous snake in your room? Then you wouldn't ask, "How am I to keep awake? How am I to be intensely aware?" You ask that question only when you are not sure that there is a poisonous snake in your room. Either you are wholly unconscious of it, or you want to play with that snake, you want to enjoy its pain and its delights.

Please follow this. There cannot be awareness, that alertness of mind and emotion, so long as mind is still caught up in both pain and pleasure. That is, when an experience gives you pain and at the same time gives you pleasure, you do nothing about it. You act only when the pain is greater than the pleasure, but if the pleasure is greater, you do nothing at all about it, because there is no acute conflict. It is only when pain overbalances pleasure, is more acute than pleasure, that you demand an action.

Most people wait for the increase of pain before they act, and during this waiting period, they want to know how to be aware. No one can tell them. They are waiting for the increase of pain before they act, that is, they wait for pain through its compulsion to force them to act, and in that compulsion there is no intelligence. It is merely environment which forces them to act in a particular way, not intelligence. Therefore when a mind is caught up in this stagnation, in this lack of tenseness, there will naturally be more pain, more conflict.

By the look of things political, war may break out again. It may break out in two years, in five years, in ten years. An intelligent man can see this and intelligently act. But the man who is stagnating, who is waiting for pain to force him to action, looks to greater chaos, greater suffering to give him impetus to act, and hence his intelligence is not functioning. There is awareness only when the mind and heart are taut, are in great tenseness.

For example, when you see that possessiveness must lead to incom-

pleteness, when you see that insufficiency, lack of richness, shallowness must ever produce dependence, when you recognize that, what happens to your mind and heart? The immediate craving is to fill that shallowness; but apart from that, when you see the futility of continual accumulation, you begin to be aware how your mind is functioning. You see that in mere accumulation there cannot be creative thinking; and yet mind is pursuing accumulation. Therefore in becoming aware of that, you create a conflict, and that very conflict will dissolve the cause of accumulation.

Question: In what way could a statesman who understood what you are saying, give it expression in public affairs? Or is it not more likely that he would retire from politics when he understood their false bases and objectives?

Krishnamurti: If he understood what I am saying, he would not separate politics from life in its completeness; and I don't see why he should retire. After all, politics now are merely instruments of exploitation; but if he considered life as a whole, not politics only—and by politics he means only *his* country, *his* people, and the exploitation of others—and regarded human problems not as national but as world problems, not as American, Hindu or German problems, then, if he understood what I am talking about, he would be a true human being, not a politician. And to me, that is the most important thing, to be a human being, not an exploiter, or merely an expert in one particular line. I tried to explain that yesterday in my talk. I think that is where the mischief lies. The politician deals with politics only; the moralist with morals, the so-called spiritual teacher with the spirit, each thinking that he is the expert, and excluding all others. Our whole structure of society is based on that, and so these leaders of the various departments create greater havoc and greater misery. Whereas if we as human beings saw the intimate connection between all these, between politics, religion, the economic and social life, if we saw the connection, then we would not think and act separately, individualistically.

In India, for example, there are millions starving. The Hindu who is a nationalist says, "Let us first become intensely national; then we shall be able to solve this problem of starvation." Whereas to me, the way to solve the problem of starvation is not to become nationalistic, but the contrary; starvation is a world problem, and this process of isolation but further increases starvation. So if the politician deals

with the problems of human life merely as a politician, then such a man creates greater havoc, greater mischief, greater misery; but if he considers the whole of life without differentiation between races, nationalities, and classes, then he is truly a human being, though he may be a politician.

Question: You have said that with two or three others who understand, you could change the world. Many believe that they themselves understand, and that there are others likewise, such as artists and men of science, and yet the world is not changed. Please speak of the way in which you would change the world. Are you not now changing the world, perhaps slowly and subtly, but nevertheless definitely, through your speaking, your living, and the influence you will undoubtedly have on human thought in the years to come? Is this the change you had in mind, or was it something immediately affecting the political, economic and racial structure?

Krishnamurti: I am afraid I have never thought of the immediacy of action and its effect. To have a lasting, true result, there must be behind action, great observation, thought, and intelligence, and very few people are willing to think creatively, or be free from influence and bias. If you begin to think individually, you will then be able to co-operate intelligently; and as long as there is no intelligence there cannot be co-operation, but only compulsion and hence chaos.

Question: To what extent can a person control his own actions? If we are, at any one time, the sum of our previous experience, and there is no spiritual self, is it possible for a person to act in any other way than that which is determined by his original inheritance, the sum of his past training, and the stimuli which play upon him at the time? If so, what causes the changes in the physical processes, and how?

Krishnamurti: "To what extent can a person control his own actions?" A person does not control his own actions if he has not understood environment. Then he is only acting under the compulsion, the influence of environment; such an action is not action at all, but is merely reaction or self-protectiveness. But when a person begins to understand environment, sees its full significance and worth, then he is master of

his own actions, then he is intelligent; and therefore no matter what the condition he will function intelligently.

"If we are, at any one time, the sum of our previous experience, and there is no spiritual self, is it possible for a person to act in any other way than that which is determined by his original inheritance, the sum of his past training, and the stimuli which play upon him at the time?"

Again, what I have said applies to this. That is, if he is merely acting from the burden of the past, whether it be his individual or racial inheritance, such action is merely the reaction of fear; but if he understands the subconscious, that is, his past accumulations, then he is free of the past, and therefore he is free of the compulsion of the environment.

After all, environment is of the present as well as of the past. One does not understand the present because of the clouding of the mind by the past; and to free the mind from the subconscious, the unconscious hindrances of the past, is not to roll memory back into the past, but to be fully conscious in the present. In that consciousness, in that full consciousness of the present, all the past hindrances come into activity, surge forward, and in that surging forward, if you are aware, you will see the full significance of the past, and therefore understand the present.

"If so, what causes the changes in the physical processes, and how?" As far as I understand the questioner, he wants to know what produces this action, this action which is forced upon him by environment. He acts in a particular manner, compelled by environment, but if he understood environment intelligently, there would be no compulsion whatever; there would be understanding, which is action itself.

Question: I live in a world of chaos, politically, economically, and socially, bound by laws and conventions which restrict my freedom. When my desires conflict with these impositions, I must break the law and take the consequences, or repress my desires. Where then, in such a world, is there any escape from self-discipline?

Krishnamurti: I have spoken about this often, but I will try again to explain it. Self-discipline is merely an adjustment to environment, brought about through conflict. That is what I call self-discipline. You have established a pattern, an ideal, which acts as a compulsion, and you are forcing the mind to adjust itself to that environment, forcing

it, modifying it, controlling it. What happens when you do that? You are really destroying creativeness; you are perverting, suppressing creative affection. But if you begin to understand environment, then there is no longer repression or mere adjustment to environment, which you call self-discipline.

How then can you understand environment? How can you understand its full worth, significance? What prevents you from seeing its significance? First of all, fear. Fear is the cause of the search for protection or security, security which is either physical, spiritual, religious or emotional. So long as there is that search there must be fear, which then creates a barrier between your mind and your environment, and thereby creates conflict; and that conflict you cannot dissolve as long as you are only concerned with adjustment, modification, and never with the discovery of the fundamental cause of fear.

So where there is this search for security, for a certainty, for a goal, preventing creative thinking, there must be adjustment, called self-discipline, which is but compulsion, the imitation of a pattern. Whereas when the mind sees that there is no such thing as security in the piling up of things or of knowledge, then mind is released from fear, and therefore mind is intelligence, and that which is intelligence does not discipline itself. There is self-discipline only where there is no intelligence. Where there is intelligence, there is understanding, free from influence, from control and domination.

Question: How is it possible to awaken thought in an organism wherein the mechanism requisite for the apprehension of abstract ideas is absent?

Krishnamurti: By the simple process of suffering; by the process of continual experience. But you see, we have taken such shelter behind false values that we have ceased to think at all, and then we ask, "What are we to do? How are we to awaken thought?" We have cultivated fears which have become glorified as virtues and ideals, behind which mind takes shelter, and all action proceeds from that shelter, from that mould. Therefore there is no thinking. You have conventions, and the adjusting of oneself to these conventions is called thought and action, which is not at all thought or action, because it is born of fear, and therefore cripples the mind.

How can you awaken thought? Circumstances, or the death of someone you love, or a catastrophe, or depression, force you into conflict.

Twelfth Talk in The Oak Grove

I think most people have lost the art of listening. They come with their particular problems, and think that by listening to my talk their problems will be solved. I am afraid this will not happen; but if you know how to listen, then you will begin to understand the whole, and your mind will not be entangled by the particular.

So, if I may suggest it, don't try to seek from this talk a solution for your particular problem, or an alleviation of your suffering. I can help you, or rather you will help yourself only if you think anew, creatively. Regard life, not as several isolated problems, but comprehensively, as a whole, with a mind that is not suffocated by the search for solutions. If you will listen without the burden of problems, and take a comprehensive outlook, then you will see that your particular problem has a different significance; and although it may not be solved at once, you will begin to see the true cause of it. In thinking anew, in relearning how to think, there will come the dissolution of the problems and conflicts with which one's mind and heart are burdened, and from which arise all disharmony, pain and suffering.

Now, each one, more or less, is consumed by desires whose objects vary according to environment, temperament and inheritance. According to your particular condition, to your particular education and upbringing, religious, social, and economic, you have established certain objectives whose attainment you are ceaselessly pursuing, and this pursuit has become paramount in your lives.

Once you have established these objectives, there naturally arise the specialists who act as your guides towards the attainment of your desires. Hence the perfection of technique, specialization, becomes the means to gain your end; and in order to gain this end, which you have established through your religious, economic, and social conditioning, you must have specialists. So your action loses its significance, its value, because you are concerned with the attainment of an objective, not with the fulfillment of intelligence which is action; you are concerned with the arrival, not with that which is fulfillment itself. Living becomes merely the means to an end, and life a school in which you learn to attain an end. Action therefore becomes but a medium through which you can come to that objective which you have established through your various environments and conditions. So life becomes

a school of great conflict and struggle, never a thing of fulfillment, of richness, of completeness.

Then you begin to ask, what is the end, the purpose of living. *This is what most people ask; this is what is in the minds of most people here.* Why are we living? What is the end? What is the goal? What is the purpose? You are concerned with the purpose, with the end, rather than with living in the present; whereas a man who fulfills never inquires into the end because fulfillment itself is sufficient. But *as you do not know how to fulfill, how to live completely, richly, sufficiently,* you begin to inquire into the purpose, the goal, the end, because you think you can then meet life, knowing the end—at least you think you can know the end—then, knowing the end, you hope to use experience as a means towards that end; hence life becomes a medium, a measure, a value to come to that attainment.

Consciously or unconsciously, surreptitiously or openly, one begins to inquire into the purpose of life, and each one receives an answer from the so-called specialists. The artist, if you ask him what is the purpose of life, will tell you that it is self-expression through painting, sculpture, music, or poetry; the economist, if you ask him, will tell you that it is work, production, co-operation, living together, functioning as a group, as society; and if you ask the religionist he will tell you the purpose of life is to seek and to realize God, to live according to the laws laid down by teachers, prophets, saviours, and that by living according to their laws and edicts you may realize that truth which is God. Each specialist gives you his answer about the purpose of life, and according to your temperament, fancies and imagination you begin to establish these purposes, these ends, as your ideals.

Such ideals and ends have become merely a haven of refuge because you use them to guide and protect yourself in this turmoil. So you begin to use these ideals to measure your experiences, to inquire into the conditions of your environment. You begin, without the desire to understand or to fulfill, merely to inquire into the purpose of environment; and in discovering that purpose, according to your conditioning, your preconceptions, you merely avoid the conflict of living without understanding.

So mind has divided life into ideals, purposes, culminations, attainments, ends; and turmoil, conflict, disturbance, disharmony; and you, yourself, the self-consciousness. That is, mind has separated life into these three divisions. You are caught up in turmoil and so through this turmoil, this conflict, this disturbance which is but sorrow, you work towards an end, a purpose. You wade through, plough through this turmoil to the goal, to the end, to the haven of refuge, to the

attainment of the ideal; and these ideals, ends, refuges have been designed by economic, religious and spiritual experts.

Thus you are, at one end, wading through conditions and environment, and creating conflict while trying to realize ideals, purposes and attainments which have become refuges and shelters at the other. The very inquiry into the purpose of life indicates the lack of intelligence in the present; and the man who is fully active—not lost in activities, as most Americans are, but fully active, intelligently, emotionally, fully alive—has fulfilled himself. Therefore the inquiry into an end is futile, because there is no such thing as an end and a beginning; there is but the continual movement of creative thinking, and what you call problems are the results of your ploughing through this turmoil towards a culmination. That is, you are concerned with how to overcome this turmoil, how to adjust yourselves to environment in order to arrive at an end. With that your whole life is concerned, not with yourself and the goal. You are not concerned with that, you are concerned with the turmoil, how to go through it, how to dominate it, how to overcome it, and therefore how to evade it. You want to arrive at that perfect evasion which you call ideals, at that perfect refuge which you call the purpose of life, which is but an escape from the present turmoil.

Naturally, when you seek to overcome, to dominate, to evade, and to arrive at that ultimate goal, there arises the search for systems and their leaders, guides, teachers, and experts; to me all these are exploiters. The systems, the methods, and their teachers, and all the complications of their rivalries, enticements, promises and deceits, create divisions in life known as sects and cults.

That is what is happening. When you are seeking an attainment, a result, an overcoming of the turmoil, and not considering the "you", the "I" consciousness, and the end which you are ceaselessly and consciously, or unconsciously, pursuing, naturally you must create exploiters, either of the past or the present; and you are caught up in their pettinesses, their jealousies, their disciplines, their disharmonies and their divisions. So the mere desire to go through this turmoil ever creates further problems, for there is no consideration of the actor or the manner of his action, but merely the consideration of the scene of turmoil as a means to get to an end.

Now to me, the turmoil, the end, and the "you" are the same; there is no division. This division is artificial, and it is created by the desire to gain, by the pursuit of acquisitive accumulation, which is born of insufficiency.

In becoming conscious of emptiness, of shallowness, one begins to

realize the utter insufficiency of one's own thinking and feeling, and so in one's thought there arises the idea of accumulation, and from that is born this division between "you", the self-consciousness, and the end. To me, as I said, there can be no such distinction, because the moment you fulfill there can no longer be the actor and the act, but only that creative movement of thought which does not seek a result, and so there is a continual living, which is immortality.

But you have divided life. Let us consider what this "I", this actor, this observer, this center of conflict is. It is but a long, continuous scroll of memory. I have discussed memory very carefully in my previous talks, and I cannot go into details now. If you are interested, you will read what I have said. This "I" is a scroll of memory in which there are accentuations. These accentuations or depressions we call complexes, and from these we act. That is, mind, being conscious of insufficiency, pursues a gain and therefore creates a distinction, a division. Such a mind cannot understand environment, and as it cannot understand it, it must rely on the accumulation of memory for guidance; *for memory is but a series of accumulations which act as a guide towards an end.* That is the purpose of memory. Memory is the lack of comprehension; that lack of comprehension is your background, and from that proceeds your action.

This memory is acting as a guide towards an end, and that end, *being pre-established, is merely a self-protective refuge which you call ideals, attainment, truth, God or perfection.* The beginning and the end, the "you" and the goal, are the results of this self-protective mind.

I have explained how a self-protective mind comes into being; it comes into being as the result of the consciousness or awareness of emptiness, of void. Therefore it begins to think in terms of achievement, acquisition, and from that it begins to function, dividing life and restricting its actions. *So the end and the "you" are the result of this self-protective mind; and turmoil, conflict and disharmony are but the processes of self-protection, and are born out of this self-protection, spiritual and economic.*

Spiritually and economically you are seeking security, because you *rely on accumulation for your richness, for your comprehension, for your fullness, for your fulfillment.* And so the cunning, in the spiritual as well as in the economic world, exploit you, for both seek power by glorifying self-protection. So each mind is making a tremendous effort to protect itself, and the end, the means, and the "you" are nothing else but the process of self-protection. What happens when there is this process of self-protection? There must be conflict with

circumstances, which we call society; there is the "you" trying to protect itself against the collective, the group, the society.

Now, the reverse of that isn't true. That is, don't think that if you cease to protect yourself you will be lost. On the contrary, you will be lost if you are protecting yourself due to the insufficiency, due to shallowness of thought and affection. But if you merely cease to protect yourself because you think through that you are going to find truth, again it will be but another form of protection.

So, as we have built up through centuries, generation after generation, this wheel of self-protection, spiritual and economic, let us find out if spiritual or economic self-protection is real. Perhaps economically you may assert self-protection for awhile. The man who has money and many possessions, and who has secured comforts and pleasures for his body, is generally, if you will observe, most insufficient and unintelligent, and is groping after so-called spiritual protection.

Let us inquire however if there really is spiritual self-protection, because economically we see there is no security. The illusion of economic security is shown throughout the world by these depressions, crises, wars, calamities, and chaos. We recognize this, and so turn to spiritual security. But to me there is no security, there is no self-protection, and there never can be any. I say there is only wisdom, which is understanding, not protection. That is, security, self-protection, is the outcome of insufficiency, in which there is no intelligence, in which there is no creative thinking, in which there is constant battle between the "you" and society, and in which the cunning exploit you ruthlessly. As long as there is the pursuit of self protection there must be conflict, and so there can be no understanding, no wisdom. And as long as this attitude exists, your search for spirituality, for truth, or for God is vain, useless, because it is merely the search for greater power, greater security.

It is only when the mind, which has taken shelter behind the walls of self-protection, frees itself from its own creations that there can be that exquisite reality. After all, these walls of self-protection are the creations of the mind which, conscious of its insufficiency, builds these walls of protection, and behind them takes shelter. One has built up these barriers unconsciously or consciously, and one's mind is so crippled, bound, held, that action brings greater conflict, further disturbances.

So the mere search for the solution of your problems is not going to free the mind from creating further problems. As long as this center of self-protectiveness, born of insufficiency, exists, there must be disturbances, tremendous sorrow and pain; and you cannot free the mind

of sorrow by disciplining it not to be insufficient. That is, you cannot discipline yourself, or be influenced by conditions and environment, in order not to be shallow. You say to yourself, "I am shallow; I recognize the fact, and how am I going to get rid of it?" I say, do not seek to get rid of it, which is merely a process of substitution, but become conscious, become aware of what is causing this insufficiency. You cannot compel it; you cannot force it; it cannot be influenced by an ideal, by a fear, by the pursuit of enjoyment and powers. You can find out the cause of insufficiency only through awareness. That is, by looking into environment and piercing into its significance there will be revealed the cunning subtleties of self-protection.

After all, self-protection is the result of insufficiency, and as the mind has been trained, caught up in its bondage for centuries, you cannot discipline it, you cannot overcome it. If you do, you lose the significance of the deceptions and subtleties of thought and emotion behind which mind has taken shelter; and to discover these subtleties you must become conscious, aware.

Now to be aware is not to alter. Our mind is accustomed to alteration which is merely modification, adjustment, becoming disciplined to a condition; whereas if you are aware, you will discover the full significance of the environment. Therefore there is no modification, but entire freedom from that environment.

Only when all these walls of protection are destroyed in the flame of awareness, in which there is no modification or alteration or adjustment, but complete understanding of the significance of environment with all its delicacies and subtleties—only through that understanding is there the eternal; because in that there is no "you" functioning as a self-protective focus. But as long as that self-protecting focus which you call the "I" exists, there must be confusion, there must be disturbance, disharmony and conflict. You cannot destroy these hindrances by disciplining yourself or by following a system or by imitating a pattern; you can understand them with all their complications only through the full awareness of mind and heart. Then there is an ecstasy, there is that living movement of truth, which is not an end, not a culmination, but an ever creative living, an ecstasy which cannot be described, because all description must destroy it. So long as you are not vulnerable to truth, there is no ecstasy, there is no immortality.

July 1, 1933

Revised Report of Fourteen Talks given by

Krishnamurti

OMMEN CAMP 1937 & 1938

*This book contains the substance
of the Talks given at the Ommen
Camp 1937 and 1938, as abridged
and revised by Krishnamurti.*

Revised Report of Fourteen Talks given by

Krishnamurti

COPYRIGHT: * PUBLISHED BY
Krishnamurti Writings Inc.
Ojai, California, U.S.A.

OMMEN CAMP 1937 & 1938

Issued-By
T-H-E-S-T-A-R-P-U-B-L-I-S-H-I-N-G-T-R-U-S-T
2123-North-Beachwood-Drive,-Hollywood,-California
Crown-House,-147-Regent-St,-London-W.1,-England
-Vasanta-Vihar,-Adyar,-Madras,-India
Ommen-(O),-Holland

Ommen Camp 1937

Amidst the changing circumstances of life, is there anything permanent? Is there any relation between ourselves and the constant change about us? If we accepted that everything is change, including ourselves, then there would never be the idea of permanency. If we thought of ourselves as in a state of continual movement, then there would be no conflict between the changing circumstances of life and the thing we now think of as being permanent.

There is a deep, abiding hope or a certainty in us that there is something permanent in the midst of continual change, and this gives rise to conflict. We see that change exists about us. We see everything decaying, withering. We see cataclysms, wars, famines, death, insecurity, disillusionment. Everything about us is in constant change, becoming and decaying. All things are worn out by use. There is nothing permanent about us. In our institutions, our morals, our theories of government, of economics, of social relationship—in all things there is a flux, there is a change.

And yet in the midst of this impermanency we feel that there is permanency; being dissatisfied with this impermanency, we have created a state of permanency, thereby giving rise to conflict between that which is supposed to be permanent and that which is changing, the transient. But if we realized that everything, including ourselves, the "I," is transient and the environmental things of life are also impermanent, surely then there would not be this aching conflict.

What is it that demands permanency, security, that longs for continuity? It is on this demand that our social, moral relationship is based.

If you really believed or deeply felt for yourself the incessant change of life, then there would never be a craving for security, for permanency. But because there is a deep craving for permanency, we create an enclosing wall against the movement of life.

So conflict exists between the changing values of life, and the desire which is seeking permanency. If we deeply felt and understood the impermanency of ourselves and of the things of this world, then there would be a cessation of bitter conflict, aches and fears. Then there would be no attachment from which arises the social and individual struggle.

What then is this thing that has assumed permanency and is ever seeking further continuity? We cannot intelligently examine this until we analyze and understand the critical capacity itself.

Our critical capacity springs from prejudices, beliefs, theories,

hopes, and so on, or from what we call experience. Experience is based on tradition, on accumulated memories. Our experience is ever tinged by the past. If you believe in God, perhaps you may have what you call an experience of Godhood. Surely this is not a true experience. It has been impressed upon our minds through centuries that there is God, and according to that conditioning we have an experience. This is not a true, first-hand experience.

A conditioned mind acting in a conditioned way cannot experience completely. Such a mind is incapable of fully experiencing the reality or the non-reality of God. Likewise a mind that is already prejudiced by a conscious or an unconscious desire for the permanent cannot fully comprehend reality. To such a prejudiced mind all inquiry is merely a further strengthening of that prejudice.

The search and the longing for immortality is the urge of accumulated memories of individual consciousness, the "I," with its fears and hopes, loves and hates. This "I" breaks itself up into many conflicting parts: the higher and the lower, the permanent and the transient, and so on. This "I," in its desire to perpetuate itself, seeks and uses ways and means to entrench itself.

Perhaps some of you may say to yourselves, "Surely with the disappearance of these cravings, there must be reality." The very desire to know if there is something beyond the conflicting consciousness of existence is an indication that the mind is seeking an assurance, a certainty, a reward for its efforts.

We see how resistance against each other is created, and that resistance through accumulative memories, through experience, is more and more strengthened, becoming more and more conscious of itself.

Thus there is your personal resistance and that of your neighbour, society. Adjustment between two or more resistances is called relationship, upon which morality is built.

Where there is love, there is not the consciousness of relationship. It is only in a state of resistance that there can be this consciousness of relationship, which is merely an adjustment between opposing conflicts.

Conflict is not only between various resistances, but also within itself, within the permanent and the impermanent quality of resistance itself.

Is there anything permanent within this resistance? We see that resistance can perpetuate itself through acquisitiveness, through ignorance, through conscious or unconscious craving for experience. But surely this continuance is not the eternal; it is merely the perpetuation of conflict.

What we call the permanent in resistance is only part of resistance itself, and so part of conflict. Thus in itself it is not the eternal, the permanent.

lating and might make you think that you should suffer. But such suffering has no significance.

There are two ways of thinking. One is through mere intellectual stimulation, without any emotional content; but when the emotions are deeply stirred, there is an integral thought process which is not superficial, intellectual. This integral thought-emotion alone can bring about lasting comprehension and action.

If what I am saying acts merely as a stimulation, then there arises the question of how to apply it to your daily life with its pains and conflicts. The how, the method, becomes all important only when explanations and stimulations are urging you to a particular action. The how, the method, ceases to be important only when you are aware, integrally.

When the mind reveals to itself its own efforts of fears and wants, then there arises integral awareness of its own impermanency which alone can set the mind free from its binding labours. Unless this is taking place, all stimulation becomes further bondage.

All artificially cultivated qualities divide: all intellectual cultivation of morality, ethics, is cruel, born of fear, only creating further resistance of man against man.

The quality of resistance is ignorance. To be acquainted with many intellectual theories is not freedom from ignorance. A man who is not integrally aware of the process of his own mind is ignorant.

To free thought from acquisitiveness, through discipline, through will, is not a release from ignorance, for it is still held in the conflict of opposites. When thought integrally perceives that the effort to rid itself of acquisitiveness is also part of acquisitiveness, then there is a beginning of enlightenment.

Whatever effort the mind makes to rid itself of certain qualities, it is still caught up in ignorance; but when the mind discerns that all effort it makes to free itself is still within the process of ignorance, then there is a possibility of breaking through the vicious circle of ignorance.

The will of satisfaction breaks up the mind into many parts, each in conflict with the other, and this will cannot be destroyed by a superior will, which is but another form of the will of satisfaction. This circle of ignorance breaks, as it were, from within only when the mind ceases to be acquisitive.

The will of satisfaction destroys love.

Questioner: How are we to distinguish between revelation, which is true thought, and experience? To me, experience, because of our untruthful methods of living, becomes limited and so is not pure revelation. They should be one.

Questioner: You mean experience is a memory, a memory of something done?

Krishnamurti: Experience may further condition thought or it may release it from limitations. We experience according to our conditioning, but that conditioning may be broken through, which may give to one's whole being an integral freedom. Morality, which should be spontaneous, has been made to follow a pattern, a principle which becomes right or wrong according to the beliefs that one holds. To alter this pattern some resort to violence, hoping to create a "true" pattern, and others turn to law to reshape it. Both hope to create "right" morality through force and conformity. But such enforcement is no longer morality.

Violence in some form is considered as a necessary means to a pacific end. We do not see that the end is controlled and shaped by the means we employ.

Truth is an experience disassociated with the past. The attachment to the past with its memories, traditions, is the continuance of a static centre which prevents the experience of truth.

When the mind is not burdened with belief, with want, with attachment, when it is creatively empty, then there is a possibility of experiencing reality.

III

All strife is one of relationship, an adjustment between two resistances, two individuals. Resistance is a conditioning, limiting or conditioning that energy which may be called life, thought, emotion. This conditioning, this resistance, has had no beginning. It has always been, and we can see that it can be continued. There are many and complex causes for this conditioning.

This conditioning is ignorance, which can be brought to an end.

Ignorance is the unawareness of the process of conditioning, which consists of the many wants, fears, acquisitive memories, and so on.

Belief is part of ignorance. Whatever action springs from belief only further strengthens ignorance.

The craving for understanding, for happiness, the attempt to get rid of this particular quality and acquire that particular virtue, all such effort is born of ignorance, which is the result of this constant want.

So in relationship strife and conflict continue.

As long as there is want, all experience further conditions thought and emotion, thus continuing conflict.

Where there is want, experience cannot be complete, thus strengthening resistance. A belief, the result of want, is a conditioning force; experience based on any belief is limiting, however wide and large it may be.

Whatever effort the mind makes to break down its own vicious circle of ignorance must further aid the continuance of ignorance. If one does not understand the whole process of ignorance, and merely makes an effort to get rid of it, thought is still acting within the circle of ignorance.

So what is one to do, discerning that whatever action, whatever effort one makes only strengthens ignorance? The very desire to break through the circle of ignorance is still part of ignorance. Then what is one to do?

Now, is this an all-important, vital question to you? If it is, then you will see that there is no direct, positive answer. For positive answers can only bring about further effort, which but strengthens the process of ignorance. So there is only a negative approach, which is to be integrally aware of the process of fear or ignorance. This awareness is not an effort to overcome, to destroy or to find a substitute, but is a stillness of neither acceptance nor denial, an integral quietness of no choice. This awareness breaks the circle of ignorance from within, as it were, without strengthening it.

Questioner: How can one know for certain whether the mind is unconditioned, because there is a possibility of illusion there?

Krishnamurti: Do not let us be concerned about the certainty of an unconditioned mind, but rather be aware of the limitations of thought-emotion.

Questioner: There is a real difference between being unaware of our conditioning and imagining that we are unconditioned.

Krishnamurti: Surely that is obvious. To inquire into the unconditioned state when one's mind is limited is so utterly futile. We have to be concerned with those causes which hold thought-emotion in bondage.

Questioner: We know there is reality and unreality, and from the unreal we must move to the real.

Krishnamurti: Surely that is another form of conditioning. How do you know that there is the real?

Questioner: Because it is there.

Krishnamurti: You have stopped thinking, if I may say so, when you assert that it is there.

open. But fear is in your heart when you are attached; then you bar your windows, then you lock your doors. You isolate yourself.

The mind has gathered certain values, treasures, and it intends to guard them. If the worth of these possessions is questioned, there is an awakening of fear. Through fear we guard them more closely, or sell out the old and acquire the new which we protect more cunningly. This isolation we call by various names.

I am asking you if you have anything precious in your mind, in your heart, that you are guarding. If you have, then you are bound to create walls against fear, and this resistance is called by many names—love, will, virtue, character.

Have you anything precious? Have you anything that may be taken away from you, your position, your ambitions, desires, hopes?

What is it that you have, actually? You may have worldly possessions which you try to safeguard. To protect them you have imperialism, nationalism, class distinctions. Each individual, each nation is doing that, breeding hate and war. Can the fear of loss be utterly removed? Every sign indicates this fear cannot be taken away by greater protection, greater nationalism, greater imperialism. Where there is attachment, there is fear.

Questioner: Is it by letting the objects go, or by setting up a different relationship between ourselves and them, that fear is dissipated?

Krishnamurti: Surely we have not yet come to the question of how to rid ourselves of fear. We are trying to find out what are the precious things that each one of us holds so cunningly, and then only can we discover the means of getting rid of fear.

Questioner: It is very difficult to know. I do not know what I am holding on to.

Krishnamurti: Yes, that is one of the difficulties, but unless you know that, fear must continue, though you may desire to get rid of it. Are you conscious with your whole being that you are protecting yourself in some form or other through belief, acquisitions, virtue, ambition?

When you begin to consider deeply, you will perceive how belief or any other form of exclusion is segregating you either as a group, or as an individual, and that belief acts as a resistance against the movement of life.

Some of you may say that the mind is not guarding a belief, but that it is part of the mind itself, that without some form of belief mind, thought, cannot exist. Or you may say that belief is not really a belief, but intuition, to be guarded, to be encouraged.

Questioner: With me it seems that belief is there, and I do not know what to do about it. I do not know whether I am guarding it or not.

What do we mean by experience? Action and reaction according to conditioned thought and emotion. The mind-heart is conditioned through conclusions, habits of thought, preconceptions, beliefs, fears, wants.

This mass of ignorance cannot be dissolved merely by experience. Experience can give to ignorance new meaning, new values, new illusions; but it is still ignorance. Mere experience cannot dissolve ignorance; it can only re-form it.

Can the mere control and change of environment dissolve ignorance? What do we mean by environment? Economic habits and values, social divisions, the morality of conformity, and so on. Will the creation of a new environment, brought about through compulsion, violence, through propaganda and threat, dissolve this ignorance? Or merely reshape it, again in a different way?

Through external domination, can this ignorance be dissolved? I say it cannot. This does not mean that the present barbarity of wars, of exploitation, cruelties, class dominations, should not be changed. But mere change of society will not alter the fundamental nature of ignorance.

We have looked to two different processes of dissolving ignorance: the one to control the environment, and the other to destroy ignorance through experience. Before you accept or deny the impossibility of doing away with ignorance through these methods, you must know the reality of each process. Do you know it? If not, you must experiment and find out. No artificial stimulation can yield reality.

Ignorance cannot be dissolved either through experience or through the mere control of environment, but it spontaneously, voluntarily withers away if there is that awareness in which there is no desire, no choice.

Questioner: I am conscious that I love, and that death will take away the one I love, and the suffering is a difficult thing for me to comprehend. I know it is a limitation and I know that I want something else, but I do not know what.

Krishnamurti: Death brings great sorrow to most of us, and we want to find a way out of that suffering. We either turn to belief in immortality, taking comfort in this, or try to forget sorrow by various means, or cultivate a superior form of indifference, through rationalization.

All things decay, everything is worn away by usage, all comes to an end. Perceiving this, some rationalize away their sorrow. By an intellectual process they deaden their suffering. Others seek to overcome this suffering through postponement, through a belief in the hereafter, through a concept of immortality. This also deadens suffering, for

belief gives shelter, comfort. One may not be afraid of the hereafter or the death of oneself, but most of us do not want to bear the agony of the loss of someone we love. So we set about to discover ways and means of frustrating sorrow.

The intellectual explanations of how to do away with suffering make one indifferent to it. In the disturbance caused by becoming aware of one's own impoverishment through the death of someone whom one loves, there comes the shock of suffering. Again the mind objects to sorrow, so it seeks ways and means to escape from it: it is satisfied with the many explanations of the hereafter, of continuity, of reincarnation, and so forth. One man rationalizes away suffering, so as to live as undisturbed as possible, and another in his belief, in his postponement, takes shelter and comfort so as not to suffer in the present. These two are fundamentally the same: neither wants to suffer, it is only their explanations that differ. The former scoffs at all belief, and the latter is deeply immersed either in bolstering up his belief in reincarnation, in immortality, and so on, or in finding out "facts," "reality" about them.

Questioner: I do not see why the refuge itself is false. I think taking refuge is silly. Reincarnation may be a fact.

Krishnamurti: If one is suffering and there is the supposed fact of reincarnation, what fundamental value has this fact if it ceases to be a refuge, a comfort? If one is starving, what good is it to know that there is over-production in the world? One wants to be fed, not facts, but much more nourishing substance.

We are not disputing as to whether reincarnation is a fact or not. To me this is utterly irrelevant. When you are diseased, hungry, facts do not relieve suffering, do not satisfy hunger. One can take hope in a future ideal state, but hunger will still continue. The fear of death and the sorrow it brings will continue even in spite of the supposed fact of reincarnation; unless, of course, one lives in complete illusion.

Why do you take shelter in a supposed fact, in a belief? I am not asking you how you know that it is a fact. You think that it is, and for the moment let us leave it at that. What prompts you to take shelter? As a man takes refuge in the rationalized conclusion that all things must decay, and thereby softens his suffering, so by taking refuge in a belief, in a supposed fact, you also deaden the action of sorrow. Because of the sharpness of misery, you desire comfort, an alleviation, and so you seek a refuge, hoping that it is enduring and real. Is it not for this fundamental reason that we seek refuge, shelter?

Questioner: Because we are not able to face life, we seek a substitute.

Krishnamurti: Merely asserting that you are seeking substitu-

tions, does not solve the problem of suffering. They prevent us from thinking and feeling deeply.

Those of you who have suffered and are suffering, what has been your experience?

Questioner: Nothing.

Krishnamurti: Some of you do nothing, bearing it indifferently. Some try to escape from it through drink, amusement, forgetting themselves in action, or taking shelter in a belief.

What is the actual reaction in the case of death? You have lost the person whom you love and you would like to have him back; you do not want to face loneliness. Realizing the impossibility of having him back, you turn, in your emptiness and sorrow, to fill your mind and heart with explanations, with beliefs, with second-hand information, knowledge and experiences.

Questioner: There is a third possibility. You show us only those two possibilities, but I feel quite distinctly that there is another way to meet sorrow.

Krishnamurti: There may be many ways of meeting sorrow, but if there is a fundamental desire to seek comfort, all the methods resolve themselves into these two definite approaches, either to rationalize, or to seek refuge. Both these methods only assuage sorrow; they offer an escape.

Questioner: What if a man re-marries?

Krishnamurti: Even if he does, the problem of suffering still remains unsolved. This is also a postponement, a forgetting. One gives himself intellectual, rational explanations because he does not want to suffer. Another takes shelter in a belief, also to avoid suffering. Another takes refuge in the idea that if he can find truth there will be at last a cessation of suffering. Another, through cultivation of irresponsibility, avoids suffering. All are attempting to escape from suffering.

Do not object to the words "shelter," "refuge." Substitute your own word—belief, God, truth, re-marriage, rationalization, and so on. But as long as there is a conscious or unconscious craving to escape from sorrow, illusion in many forms must exist.

Now, why should you not suffer? When you are happy, when you are joyous, you do not say you must not be happy. You do not run away from joy, you do not seek a refuge from it. When you are in a state of ecstasy, you do not resort to beliefs, to substitutions. On the contrary, you destroy all things which stand in its way, your gods, your moralities, your values, your beliefs, everything, to maintain this ecstasy.

Now why don't you do the same thing when you are suffering? Why don't you destroy all things that interfere with sorrow, the mind's many

explanations, escapes, fears and illusions? If you sincerely and deeply put this question to yourself you will see that beliefs, gods, hopes, no longer matter. Then your life has a new and fundamental meaning. In the flame of love, all fear is consumed.

V

Though intellectually we may perceive the cause of suffering, it has but little influence on our lives. Though we may intellectually agree that so long as there is attachment there is fear and sorrow, yet our desire is so strongly possessive that it overcomes all reasoning. Even though we may know the cause of suffering, suffering will continue, for mere intellectual knowledge is not sufficient to destroy the cause. So when the mind through analysis discovers the cause of suffering, that very discovery itself may become a refuge. The hope that by discovering the cause of sorrow, suffering will cease, is an illusion.

Why does the mind seek the cause of sorrow? Obviously to overcome it. Yet in the moments of ecstasy there is no search for its cause; if there were, ecstasy would cease. In craving for ecstasy, we grope after those causes that stand in the way. Thus very craving for ecstasy and the intense desire to overcome sorrow prevent their fulfilment.

A mind that is burdened with the desire for reality, for happiness, for love, cannot free itself from fear. Fear deadens sorrow as also it distorts joy. Is our whole being in direct contact with sorrow as it is with happiness, with joy?

We are aware that we are not integral with sorrow; that there is a part of us which is trying to run away from it. In this process the mind has accumulated many treasures to which it clings desperately. When we realize this process of accumulation, then there is an urge to put a stop to it. Then we begin to seek methods, the way to get rid of these burdens. The very search for a method is another form of escape.

The choice of methods, of a way to rid yourself of those accumulated burdens, which cause resistance, this very choice is born of a desire not to suffer and is therefore prejudicial. This prejudice is the outcome of the desire for refuge, comfort.

Questioner: I think that nobody has thought what you have said just now. It is too complicated.

Krishnamurti: We are trying to perceive, to feel truth which shall liberate man, not merely to find out what are the causes of sorrow. If

what I have said, which may sound complicated, is the truth, then it is liberating.

The discovery of truth is a complex process, for the mind has enveloped itself in many illusions.

The dawning of truth does not lie in the choice of the essential as against the unessential. But when you begin to perceive the illusion of choice itself, then that revelation is liberating, spontaneously destroying the illusion upon which the mind nourishes itself.

Is it love that, when it is thwarted, suffers, and there is bitterness, there is emptiness? It is the exposure of one's own smallness of love that is hurting.

Whenever the mind chooses, its choice must be based on self-protective prejudice, and as we desire not to suffer, its acts are based on fear. Fear and reality cannot exist together. One destroys the other. But it is one of the illusions of the mind that creates the hope of something beyond its own darkness. This something, this hoped-for reality, is another form of refuge, another escape from sorrow. The mind perpetuates its own conditioned state through fear.

Questioner: What you say leads to a very materialistic form of life.

Krishnamurti: What do you mean by a materialistic form of life? That there is only this life, that there is no reality, no God, that morality must be based on social and economic convenience, and so on. Now, what is the non-materialistic attitude towards life? That there is God, that there is a soul which continues, that there is a hereafter, that the individual holds within himself the spark of the eternal. What is the difference between the two, the materialistic and the religious?

Questioner: Both are beliefs.

Krishnamurti: But why then do you despise the materialistic form of life?

Questioner: Because it denies persistence.

Krishnamurti: You are merely reacting to prejudice. Your religious life is fundamentally an irreligious one. Though you may cover it up by talking about God, love, the hereafter, in your heart it means nothing, just so many phrases which you have learnt as the materialistic man has learnt his ideas and phrases. Both the religious and the materialistic mind are conditioned by their own prejudices which prevent the integral comprehension of truth and the communion with it.

Questioner: Yesterday you asked us to say why we tried to escape from suffering, and suddenly I saw the whole significance of it. If we give ourselves over to suffering instead of trying to escape from it, we break up the resistance within us.

Krishnamurti: Yes, if it is not the effort of the will. But is not this giving oneself over to sorrow artificial, an effort of the intellect to gain something? Surely you do not give yourself over to ecstasy? If you do, it is not ecstasy.

Questioner: *I did not mean that. I meant that instead of trying to escape, you just suffer.*

Krishnamurti: Why do you feel that you must suffer? When you say to yourself that you must not escape, you are hoping that out of suffering you will achieve something. But when you are integrally aware of the illusion of all escape, then there is no will to resist the desire to escape, nor the will to achieve something through suffering.

Questioner: *Yes, I see that.*

Questioner: *Will you please repeat what you have just now said.*

Krishnamurti: One does not give oneself over to joy. There is no duality in ecstasy. It is a state which spontaneously comes into being without our willing it. Suffering is an indication of duality. Without understanding this, we perpetuate duality through the many intellectual efforts and processes of overcoming it, giving oneself over to its opposite, developing virtues, and so forth. All such attempts only strengthen duality.

Questioner: *Do not the resistances which we put up against suffering also act as resistances against ecstasy?*

Krishnamurti: Of course. If there is a lack of sensibility to ugliness, to sorrow, there must also be deep insensitiveness to beauty, to joy. Resistance against sorrow is also a barrier to happiness.

What is ecstasy? That state of being when the mind and heart are in complete union, when fear does not tear them asunder, when the mind is not withholding.

Questioner: *Is there a better way of suffering? A better way of living?*

Krishnamurti: There is, and this is what I have been trying to explain. If each one becomes aware of his own conditioned state, then he will begin to free himself from hate, ambition, attachment, from those fears which cripple life.

If the mind destroys one conditioned state, only to enter into another, life becomes utterly vain and hopeless. This is what is happening to most of us, wandering from cage to cage, thinking that each is more free than the one before, while in reality each is but a different kind of limitation. That which is free cannot grow from the less to the more.

Questioner: *I accept the conditioned state in the same manner as that the globe is revolving, as a necessary part of development.*

Krishnamurti: Then we are not using intelligence. By merely asserting that all existence is conditioned, we shall never find out if there is a state that may not be conditioned. By becoming integrally aware of the conditioned state, each one will then begin to comprehend the freedom that comes through the cessation of fear.

VI

Relationship may be limited, between two individuals, or it may be with many, in an ever widening sphere. Limited or wide, the importance lies in the character of relationship.

What do we mean by relationship? It is an adjustment between two individualistic desires. In this relationship there is strife of opposing ambitions, attachments, hopes, wants. Thus almost all relationship becomes one of strain and conflict. There is relationship not only with people and external values, but also with those values and conceptions within us.

We are aware of this strife between friends, between neighbours, between ourselves and society.

Must this conflict ever continue? We may adjust our relationship with another so cunningly that we never come into contact with each other vitally; or adjustment being impossible, two people may be forced to separate. But as long as there is any kind of activity there must be relationship between the individual and society, which may be one or many. Isolation is possible only in a complete state of neurosis. Unless one acts mechanically, unthinking and unfeeling, or is so conditioned that there is only one pattern of thought and feeling, all relationship is one of adjustment either of strife and resistance, or of yielding.

Love is not of relationship, nor of adjustment; it is of a wholly different quality.

Can this strife in relationship ever cease? We cannot, through mere experience, bring about a relationship without strife. Experience is a reaction to previous conditioning which in relationship produces conflict. The mere domination of environment with its social values, habits and thoughts, cannot bring about a relationship which is free from strife.

There is conflict between the conditioning influences of desire and the swift, lively current of relationship. It is not, as most people think.

relationship that is limiting, but it is desire that conditions. It is desire, conscious or unconscious, that is ever causing friction in relationship.

Desire springs from ignorance. Desire cannot exist independently; it must feed on previous conditioning, which is ignorance.

Ignorance can be dissipated. It is possible. Ignorance consists of the many forms of fear, of belief, of want, of attachment. These create conflict in relationship.

When we are integrally aware of the process of ignorance, voluntarily, spontaneously, there is the beginning of that intelligence which meets all conditioning influences. We are concerned with the awakening of this intelligence, of this love, which alone can free the mind and heart from strife.

The awakening of this intelligence, this love, is not the result of a disciplined, systematized morality, nor is it an achievement to be sought after, but it is a process of constant awareness.

Questioner: Relationship is also a contact between habits, and through habit there is the continuity of activity.

Krishnamurti: In most cases action is the result of habit, habit based on tradition, on thought and desire pattern, and this gives to action an apparent continuity. Generally, then, habit rules our action and relationship.

Is action merely habit? If action is the outcome of mere mechanical habit, then it must lead to confusion and sorrow. In the same way, if relationship is merely the contact of two individualized habits, then all such relationship is suffering. But unfortunately we reduce all contact with each other to a dull and weary pattern through incapacity of adjustment, through fear, through lack of love.

Habit is conscious or unconscious repetition of action which is guided by memory of past incidents, of tradition, of thought desire patterns, and so forth. One often realizes that one is living in a narrow groove of thought and, breaking away from it, slips into another. This change from habit to habit is often called progress, experience or growth.

Action, which may once have followed full awareness, often becomes habitual, without thought, without any depth of feeling.

Can true relationship exist when the mind is merely following a pattern?

Questioner: But there is a spontaneous response, which is not habit at all.

Krishnamurti: Yes, we know of this, but such occasions are rare, and we would like to establish a relationship of spontaneity. Between what we would like to be and what we are there is a wide gap. What we would like to be is a form of ambitious attachment which has no

significance to one who is searching out reality. If we can understand what we are, then perhaps we shall know what is.

Can true relationship exist when the mind is merely following a pattern? When one is aware of that state called love, there is a dynamic relationship that is not of a pattern, that is beyond all mental definitions and calculations. But, through the conditioning influence of fear and desire, such relationship is reduced to mere gratification, to habit, to routine. Such a state is not true relationship but a form of death and decay. How can there be true relationship between two individualized patterns, though there may be mechanical response from each?

Questioner: There is a continual adjustment between these two habits.

Krishnamurti: Yes, but such adjustment is merely mechanical, which conflict and suffering enforce; such enforcement does not break down the fundamental desire to form habit patterns. Outside influences and inward determinations do not break down the formation of habit, but only aid in superficial and intellectual adjustment which is not conducive to true relationship.

Is this state of patterns, of ideals, of conformity, conducive to fulfilment, to creative and intelligent life and action? Before we can answer this question, do we realize or are we aware of this state? If we are not aware of it there is no conflict, but if we are, then there is anxiety and suffering. From this we try to escape or try to break down old habits and patterns. In overcoming them, one merely creates others; the desire for mere change is stronger than the desire to be aware of the whole process of the formation of habit, of patterns. Hence we move from habit to habit.

Questioner: Yes, I know habit is foolish, but can I break away from it?

Krishnamurti: Before you ask me how to overcome a particular habit, let us find out what is the thing that is creating habit, because you may break away from one habit, one pattern, but in that very process you may be forming another. This is what we generally do, go from one habit to another. We will go on doing this indefinitely unless we find out why it is that the mind ever seeks to form habits, follow thought-desire patterns.

All true relationship requires constant alertness and adjustment not according to pattern. Where there is habit, the following of patterns, ideals, this state of pliability is impossible. To be pliable demands constant thought and affection, and as the mind finds it is easier to establish behaviour patterns than to be aware, it proceeds to form habits; and when it is shaken from a particular one, through affliction

and uncertainty, it moves on to another. Fear for its own security and comfort compels the mind to follow thought-desire patterns. Society thus becomes the maker of habit, patterns, ideals, for society is the neighbour, the immediate relation with which one is ever in contact.

VII

Suffering is the indication of the process of thought and desire patterns. This suffering the mind seeks to overcome by putting itself to sleep again through the development of other patterns and other illusions. From this self-imposed limitation the mind is again shaken, and again it induces itself to thoughtlessness, till it so identifies itself with some thought-desire pattern or belief that it can no longer be shaken or allow itself to suffer. This state many realize and consider as the highest achievement.

Once you develop the will that merely overcomes all habit, conditioning, that very will itself becomes thoughtless and repetitive.

We must understand both the habitual action and the ideal or conceptual action, before we can comprehend action without illusion. For reality lies in actuality.

Awareness is not the development of an introspective will, but it is the spontaneous unification of all the separative forces of desire.

Questioner: Is awareness a matter of slow growth?

Krishnamurti: Where there is intense interest there is full awareness. As one is mentally lazy and emotionally crippled with fear, awareness becomes a matter of slow growth. Then it is not really awareness but a process of carefully building up walls of resistance. As most of us have built up these self-protecting walls, awareness appears to be a slow process, a growth, thus satisfying our slothfulness. Out of this laziness we carve theories of postponement—eventually but not now, enlightenment is a process of slow growth, of life after life, and so on. We proceed to rationalize this slothfulness and satisfactorily arrange our lives according to it.

Questioner: This process seems inevitable. But how is one to awaken quickly?

Krishnamurti: Is it a slow process for individuals to change from violence to peace? I think not. If one really perceives the whole significance of hate, affection spontaneously comes into being; what prevents

this immediate and deep perception is our unconscious fear of intellectual and desire commitments and patterns. For such a perception might involve a drastic change in our daily life: the withering away of ambition, the putting away of all nationalistic, class distinctions, attachments, and so on. This fear is prompting us, warning us, and we consciously or unconsciously yield to it and thereby increase our safeguards, which only engenders further fear. So long as we do not comprehend this process we shall ever be thinking in terms of postponement, of growth, of overcoming. Fear cannot be dissolved in the future; only in constant awareness can it cease to be.

Questioner: I think we must come quickly to peace.

Krishnamurti: If you hate because your intellectual and emotional well-being is threatened in many ways and if you merely resort to further violence, though you may successfully, for the moment at least, ward off fear, hate will continue. It is only by constantly being aware, that fear and hate can disappear. Do not think in terms of postponement. Begin to be aware, and if there is interest, that itself will bring about, spontaneously, a state of peace, of affection.

War, the war in you, the hate of your neighbour, of other peoples, cannot be overcome by violence in any form. If you begin to see the utter necessity of deeply thinking-feeling about it now, your prejudices, your conditioning, which are the cause of hate and fear, will be revealed. In this revelation there is an awakening of affection, love.

Questioner: I think that it will take all our life to overcome fear, hate.

Krishnamurti: You are again thinking in terms of postponement. Does each one feel the appallingness of hate and perceive its consequences? If you deeply feel this, then you are not concerned with when hate will cease, for it has already yielded to something in which alone there can be deep human contact and co-operation.

If one is conscious of hate or violence in different forms, can that violence be done away with through the process of time?

Questioner: No, not by the mere passing of time. One would have to have a method to get rid of it.

Krishnamurti: No, the mere passage of time cannot resolve hate; it may be covered over heavily or carefully watched over and guarded. But fear, hate, will still continue. Can a system help you to get rid of hate? It may help you to subjugate it, control it, strengthen your will to combat it, but it will not bring about that affection which alone can give man abiding freedom. If you do not feel deeply that hate is
ly poisonous, no system, no authority, can destroy it for you.

Questioner: You may intellectually see that hate is poison, but still you feel hate.

Krishnamurti: Why does this happen? Is it not because intellectually you are over-developed and still primitive in your desires? There cannot be harmony between the beautiful and the ugly. The cessation of hate cannot be brought about through any method, but only through constant awareness of the conditionings that have brought about this division between love and hate.

Why does this division exist?

Questioner: Lack of love.

Questioner: Ignorance.

Krishnamurti: Don't you see, by merely repeating that if one really lived rightly this division would not exist, that by not being ignorant it would disappear, that habit is the cause of this division, that if we were not conditioned there would be perfect love—don't you see that you are merely intoning certain phrases that you have learnt? Of what value is this? None. Is each one of you conscious of this division? Please, don't answer. Consider what is taking place in yourself.

We see that we are in conflict, that there is hate and yet at the same time a disgust for it. There is this division. We can see how this division has come into being, through various conditioning causes. The mere consideration of the causes is not going to bring freedom from hate, fear. The problem of starvation is not solved by merely discovering its causes—the bad economic system, over-production, mal-distribution, and so on. If you, personally, are hungry, your hunger will not be satisfied merely by your knowing the causes of it. In the same way, merely knowing the causes of hate, fear, with its various conflicts, will not dissolve it. What will put an end to hate is choiceless awareness, the cessation of all intellectual effort to overcome hate.

Questioner: We are not conscious enough of this hate.

Krishnamurti: When we are conscious, we object to the conflict, to the suffering involved in this conflict, and proceed to act, hoping to overcome all conflict. This only further strengthens the intellect. You have to be aware of all this process, silently, spontaneously, and in this awareness there comes a new element which is not the result of any violence, any effort, and which alone can free you from hate and those conditionings that cripple.

Hate is not dissolved through experience, nor through any accumulation of virtue, nor can it be overcome by the practice of love. All these merely cover up fear, hate. Be aware of this, and then there will be a tremendous transformation in your life.

Questioner: What relationship has the illusion of this psychological growth to the growth which we see around us?

Krishnamurti: We see that which is capable of growth is not enduring. But to our psychological growth each one of us clings, as something permanent. If we felt deeply and so were aware that all things are in continual change, a constant becoming, then perhaps we should be able to free ourselves from the conflict which exists in ourselves and so with the neighbour, with society.

Questioner: It seems to me I cannot jump from hate to love, but I can transform my antipathy slowly into a feeling of understanding and like.

Krishnamurti: We cannot wipe the mind clean of past conditioning and start anew.

But we can be aware what it is that maintains fear, hate. We can be aware of the psychological causes and reactions that prevent us from acting integrally. The past is dominating us, with its beliefs, hopes, fears, conclusions, memories; this prevents us from integral action. We cannot wipe out the past, for in its essence the mind is of the past. But by being aware of the accumulations of the past and their effect on the present, we shall begin to free ourselves without violence from those values which cripple the mind and heart.

Is this, the past with its dominating influences, fears, an acute problem to you, personally?

Life as it is, breeding wars, hatreds, divisions, despoiling unity—is this a problem to you? If it is, then, as you are a part of it, you will comprehend it only through your own sufferings, ambitions, fears. The world is you and its problem is your intimate problem. If it is an acute problem, as I hope it is with each one of you, then you will never escape into any theories, explanations, “facts,” illusions. But that requires great alertness, one has to be intensely aware; so we prefer the easier way, the way of escape. How can you solve this problem if your mind and heart are being diverted from it?

I do not say that this problem is simple. It is complex. So you must give your mind and heart to it. But how can you give your whole being

to it if you are running away from it, if you are being diverted through various escapes which the mind has established for itself?

Questioner: But we do not see it at the moment of escape.

Krishnamurti: We are attempting to understand ourselves, to open up the hidden corners of the mind, to see the various escapes, so that spontaneously we shall face life, deeply and fully. Any form of overcoming one habit by another, overcoming hate by virtues, is a substitution, and the cultivation of opposites does not do away with those qualities from which we desire to free ourselves. We have to perceive hate, not as an antithesis of love, but as in itself poisonous, an evil.

Questioner: Don't you think that we can see the different escapes? We can know that hatred is poisonous, and at the same time we know that we are going on with it. But I think that if we would comprehend it fully, then we must be willing to leave everything—home, wife, everything; we must shake hands and say good-bye and go to a concentration camp.

Krishnamurti: Do not think of the consequences of being without hate, but consider if you can free yourself from it. Do you say to yourself that you are incapable of getting rid of hate?

Questioner: We can only try, we do not know.

Krishnamurti: Why do you say you do not know?

Questioner: Because it is not our actual problem.

Krishnamurti: Though hate exists in the world, in you and about you, yet you say that it is not an acute problem to you. You are not conscious of it. Why are you not conscious of it? Either because you are free from it, or you have so entrenched yourself, so cunningly protected yourself, that you have no fear, no hate, for you are certain of your own security.

Questioner: We do not feel hate at this moment.

Krishnamurti: When you are not here, then you do feel it, then it is a problem to you. Here you have momentarily escaped from it, but the problem still exists. You cannot escape from it, either here or in any other place. It is a problem to you, whether you want it or not. Though it is a problem, you have put it away, you have become unconscious of it. And therefore you say that you do not know how you will act with regard to it.

Questioner: We often wish that life itself would directly act, and take away from us those things we cherish though we know their worthlessness. Is this also an escape?

Krishnamurti: Some people seem relieved in time of war. They

have no responsibilities; their life is directed by the War Office. In this lies one of the main reasons why authority, temporal or spiritual, flourishes and is worshipped. Death is preferable to life.

We have been trained to think that hate is inevitable, that we must go through this stage, that it is part of human heritage, instinct.

We are used to thinking that hate cannot be got rid of immediately; that we must go through some kind of discipline to overcome hate. Thus there is a dual process going on within us, violence and peace, hate and affection, anger and kindness.

Our effort goes towards bridging these two separate forces, or overcoming one by the other, or concentrating on one so that its opposite shall disappear.

Whatever effort you make to destroy hate by love, is in vain, for violence, fear, reveal themselves in another form. We have to go much deeper than mere discipline; we have to find out why this duality of hate and affection exists within us. Until this dual process ceases, the conflict of opposites must continue.

Questioner: Perhaps hate does not really belong to me?

Questioner: Is our love too poor then?

Krishnamurti: These questions are very revealing, they show how the mind is conditioned.

Whatever effort the mind makes must be part of that from which it is trying to get away.

The mind finds that it does not pay to hate, for it has discovered that there is too much suffering involved in it, and so it makes an effort to discipline itself, to overcome hate by love, to subdue violence and fear by peace. All this indicates the fundamental desire merely to escape from suffering; that is, to guard itself in those virtues and qualities that will not give it pain, that will not cause disturbance. Until this desire, this craving for self-protective security, ceases, fear must continue, with all its consequences. Mind cannot get rid of fear. In its attempt to do so it cultivates the opposites, which is part of fear itself. Thus the mind divides itself, creates within itself a dual process. All effort on the part of the mind must maintain this duality, though it may develop tendencies, characteristics, virtues, to overcome that very duality.

Questioner: I do not quite see how the mind has divided itself into love and hate.

Krishnamurti: There is good and evil, the light and the dark. Light and darkness cannot exist together. One destroys the other.

If light is light, then darkness, evil, ceases to exist. Effort is not necessary, it is then non-existent. But we are in a state of continual

effort, because that which to us is light, is *not* light, it is only the light, the good of the intellect.

We are making constant effort to overcome, to acquire, to possess, to be detached, to expand. There are moments of clarity amidst the enveloping confusion. We desire this clarity and cling to it, hoping that it will dissolve the conflicting wants. This desire for clarity, this desire to overcome one quality by another, is waste of energy; for the will that craves, the will that overcomes, is the will of success, satisfaction, the will of security. This will must ever continue creating and maintaining fear, even though it is asserting that it is seeking truth, God. Its clarity is the clarity of escape, of illusion, but not the clarity of reality.

When the will destroys itself, spontaneously, then there is that truth which is beyond all effort. Effort is violence; love and violence cannot exist together.

The conflict in which we exist is not a struggle between good and evil, between the self and the not-self. The struggle is in our own self-created duality, between our various self-protective desires. There cannot be a conflict between light and darkness; where light is, darkness is not. As long as fear exists, there must continue conflict, though that fear may disguise itself under different names. And as fear cannot free itself through any means, for all its efforts spring from its own source, there must be the cessation of all intellectual safeguards. This cessation comes, spontaneously, when the mind reveals to itself its own process. This takes place only when there is integral awareness, which is not the result of a discipline, or of a moral or economic system, or of enforcement.

Each one has to become aware of the process of ignorance, the illusions that one has created.

Intellect cannot lead you out of this present chaos, confusion and suffering. Reason must exhaust itself, not by retreating, but through integral comprehension and love of life.

When reason no longer has the capacity to protect you, through explanations, escapes, logical conclusions, then when there is complete vulnerability, utter nakedness of your whole being, there is the flame of love.

Truth alone can free each one from the sorrow and confusion of ignorance.

Truth is not the end of experience, it is life itself. It is not of tomorrow, it is of no time. It is not a result, an achievement, but the cessation of fear, want.

Ommen Camp 1938

Have you ever tried to communicate to a friend something which you feel very deeply? You must have found it very difficult, however intimate that friendship may be. You can imagine how difficult it is for us here to understand each other, for our relationship is peculiar. There is not that friendship which is essential for deep communication and understanding. Most of us have the attitude either of a disciple towards a teacher, or of a follower, or of one who tries to force himself to a particular point of view, and communication becomes very difficult. It is further complicated if you have a propagandist attitude, if you come merely in order to propagate certain ideas of a particular society or sect, or an ideology that is popular at the moment. Free communication is possible only when both the listener and the talker are thinking together on the same point.

During these days of the Camp there should not be this attitude of a teacher and a disciple, of a leader and a follower, but rather, a friendly communication with each other, which is impossible if the mind is held in any belief or in any ideology. There is never a friendship between a leader and a follower, and hence deep communication between them is impossible.

I am talking about something which to me is real, in which I take joy, and it will be of very little significance to you if you are thinking of something quite different. If we can somehow go beyond this absurd relationship that we have established through tradition and legend, through superstition and all kinds of fantasies, then perhaps we shall be able to understand each other more naturally.

What I want to say seems, to me at least, very simple, but when these thoughts and feelings are put into words they become complicated. Communication becomes more difficult when you, with your particular prejudices, superstitions and barriers, try to perceive what I am trying to say, instead of attempting to clear your own mind of those perversions that prevent full understanding—which alone can bring about a critical and affectionate attitude.

As you know, this Camp is not meant for propaganda purposes, for either Right or Left, or for any particular society or ideology. I know there are many here who regularly come to the Camp to do propaganda for their societies, for their nationality, for their church, and so on. So I would seriously ask you not to indulge in this kind of pastime. We are here for more serious purposes. Those who have an itch for this kind of pastime have plenty of opportunity elsewhere. Here, at least, let us try to find out what we individually think and feel, and

you love to do? You do not know. We do not know what it is wise to do, and what is foolish, and the discovery of what is wise and what is foolish is the whole process of living. You are not going to discover this in the twinkling of an eye.

But how is one to discover it? Is it to be discovered—what is wise and what is foolish—mechanically, or spontaneously? When you do something with your whole being, in which there is no sense of frustration or fear, no limitation, in this state of action you are yourself, irrespective of any outward condition. I say, if you can come to that state, when you are yourself in action, then you will find out the ecstasy of reality, God.

Is this state to be mechanically achieved, cultivated, or does it come into being spontaneously? I will explain what I mean by the mechanical process. All action imposed from without must be habit-forming, must be mechanical, and therefore not spontaneous. Can you discover what it is to be yourself through tradition?

Let me here digress a little and say that we will try, as we did last year, to talk over these ideas during the following meetings. We will try to take up the various points; not arguing with each other, but in a friendly manner finding out what we individually think about these things. In my first talk I want to give a brief outline of what, to me, is the real process of living.

Can you be yourself if your being is in any way touched by tradition? Or can you find yourself through example, through precept?

Questioner: What is precept?

Krishnamurti: Through a precept, through a saying—that evil is all that which divides and good all that which unites—by merely following a principle, can you be yourself? Will living according to a pattern, an ideal, following it ruthlessly, meditating upon it, bring you to the discovery of yourself? Can that which is real be perceived through discipline or will? That is, by exertion, by an effort of the intellect, curbing, controlling, disciplining, guiding, forcing thought in a particular direction, can you know yourself? And can you know yourself through behaviour patterns; that is, by preconceiving a mode of life, of what is good, the ideal, and following it constantly, twisting your thought and feeling to its dictates, putting aside what you consider evil and ruthlessly following what you consider to be good? Will this process reveal to you that which you are, whatever that is? Can you discover yourself through compulsion? It is a form of compulsion. this ruthless overcoming of difficulties through will, discipline—this subduing and resisting, a withholding and a yielding.

All this is the exertion of will, which I consider to be mechanical a process of the intellect. Can you know yourself through these means—

through these mechanical means? All effort, mechanical or of the will, is habit-forming. Through the forming of habit you may be able to create a certain state, achieve a certain ideal which you may consider to be yourself, but as it is the result of an intellectual effort or the effort of the will, it is wholly mechanical and hence not true. Can this process yield the comprehension of yourself, of what you are?

Then there is the other state, which is spontaneous. You can know yourself only when you are unaware, when you are not calculating, not protecting, not constantly watching to guide, to transform, to subdue, to control; when you see yourself unexpectedly, that is, when the mind has no preconceptions with regard to itself, when the mind is open, unprepared to meet the unknown.

If your mind is prepared, surely you cannot know the unknown, for you are the unknown. If you say to yourself, "I am God," or "I am nothing but a mass of social influences or a bundle of qualities"—if you have any preconception of yourself, you cannot comprehend the unknown, that which is spontaneous.

So spontaneity can come only when the intellect is unguarded, when it is not protecting itself, when it is no longer afraid for itself; and this can happen only from within. That is, the spontaneous must be the new, the unknown, the incalculable, the creative, that which must be expressed, loved, in which the will as the process of intellect, controlling, directing, has no part. Observe your own emotional states and you will see that the moments of great joy, great ecstasy, are unpremeditated; they happen, mysteriously, darkly, unknowingly. When they are gone, the mind desires to re-create those moments, to recapture them, and so you say to yourself: "If I can follow certain laws, form certain habits, act in this way but not in that, then I shall have those moments of ecstasy again."

There is always a war between the spontaneous and the mechanical. Please *do not* adapt this to suit your own religious, philosophic terms. To me, what I am saying is vitally new and cannot be twisted to suit your particular prejudices of the higher and the lower self, the transient and the permanent, the self and the not-self, and so on. Most of us have, unfortunately, almost destroyed this spontaneity, this creative joy of the unknown from which alone there can be wise action. We have sedulously cultivated through generations of tradition, of morality based on will, of compulsion, the mechanical attitude of life, calling it by sweet-sounding words; in essence it is purely mechanical, intellectual. The process of discipline, of violence, of subjugation, of resistance, of imitation—all this is the outcome of the development of the mere intellect, which has its root in fear. The mechanical is overwhelmingly dominant in our lives. On this is based our civilization and morality—

it? Are you going to free yourself from fear mechanically, through will; or will it begin to dissolve of its own accord, spontaneously? The mechanical or the will process can but hide away fear more and more, guard it and carefully withhold it, allowing only the reactions of controlled morality. Below this controlled behaviour pattern, fear must ever continue. This is the inevitable result of the mechanical process of the will, with its disciplines, desires, controls, and so on.

Until one frees oneself from the mechanical, there cannot be the spontaneous, the real. Craving for the real, for that flame which bursts from within, cannot bring it about.

What will free you from the mechanical is the deep observation of the process of the will, being one with it, without any desire to be free from it. Now you observe the mechanical attitude towards life with a desire to get rid of it, to alter it, transform it. How can you transform will when desire is of the will itself?

You must be aware of the whole process of will, of the mechanical, of its struggles, its escapes, its miseries; and as the farmer allows the soil to lie fallow after a harvest, so must you allow yourself to be silent, negative, without any expectation. It is not easy. If in the hope of gaining the real, you mechanically allow yourself to be silent, force yourself to be negative, then fear is the reward. As I have said, this creative emptiness is not to be run after or sought by devious ways. It must happen. Truth is. It is not the result of organized morality, for morality based on will is not moral.

We have many problems, individual as well as social, and for these problems there is no solution through the intellect, through the will. As long as the process of will continues in any form, there must be confusion and sorrow. Through will you cannot know yourself, nor can there be the real.

II

You may remember that I was trying to explain the difference between spontaneity and mechanical action, the mechanical being the morality of the will, and the spontaneous that which is born out of the depth of one's own being. This morning I will talk about one or two things concerning this, and then let us discuss them.

I was saying that fear in any form creates habit, which prevents

unconditioned freedom in which alone there is reality, in which alone there can be the integrity of oneself. Fear prevents spontaneity.

Now it would be rather ridiculous, and impossible, to consider what it is to be spontaneous, or to judge who is spontaneous and who is not, and to consider also the qualities, the characteristics of spontaneity. Each one will know what it is to be spontaneous, to be real, when there is the right inward condition. You will know for yourself when you are truly spontaneous, when you are really yourself. To judge another to see if he is spontaneous means, really, that you have a standard of spontaneity, which is absurd. The judgment of what is spontaneous reveals a mind that is merely reacting mechanically to its own habit and moral patterns.

So it is futile and a waste of time, leading to mere opinion, to consider what it is to be real, spontaneous, to be oneself. Such consideration leads to illusion. Let us concern ourselves with what is the necessary condition that will reveal the real.

Now what is the right condition? There is no division as the *inner* and the *outer* condition; I am dividing it as the inner and the outer only for purposes of observation, to understand it more clearly. This division does not exist in reality.

From the right inward state alone can the outer conditions be changed, ameliorated and fundamentally transformed. The approach from the merely superficial, that is, from the *outer*, in creating right conditions, will have little significance in understanding truth, God

One has to understand what is the right inner condition, but not from any superficial compulsion or authority. The deep inward change will always intelligently deal with the outward conditions. Once and for all, let us fully perceive the importance of this necessary inward change and not merely rely on the change of outer circumstances. It is ever the inward motive and intentions that change and control the outer. Motives, desires, are not fundamentally altered by merely controlling the outer.

If a man is inwardly peaceful and is affectionate, without greed, surely such a man does not need laws imposing peace on him, police to regulate his conduct, institutions to maintain his morality.

Now we have given great significance to the outer, to maintain peace; through institutions, laws, police, armies, churches, and so on, we seek to maintain a peace which does not exist. By imposition and domination, opposing violence by violence, we hope to create a peaceful state.

If you really comprehend this, deeply, honestly, then you will see the importance of not approaching the many problems of life as the outer and the inner, but only from the comprehensive and the integral.

So what is the inward condition necessary to be oneself, to be spontaneous? The first necessary inward condition is that the habit-forming mechanism must cease. What is the motive power behind this mechanism?

Before we answer this we must first find out whether our thoughts and feelings are the result of mere habit, tradition, and are following ideals and principles. Most of us, if we really think about it intelligently, honestly, will see that our thoughts and feelings usually spring from various standardized patterns, whether they be ideals or principles.

The continuation of this mechanical habit and its motive power, is the desire to be certain. The whole mechanism of tradition, of imitation, of example, the building up of a future, of the ideal, of the perfect and its achievement, is the desire to be secure; and the development of various supposedly necessary qualities is for its assurance, for its success.

Desire gives a false continuity to our thinking, and mind clings to that continuity whose actions are the mere following of patterns, ideals, principles, and the establishment of habit. Thus experience is never new, never fresh, never joyous, never creative; and hence the extraordinary vitality of dead things, of the past.

Now let us take a few examples and see what I mean. Take the habit of nationalism, which is now becoming more and more strong and cruel. Is not nationalism really a false love of man? One who is at heart a nationalist can never be a complete human being. To a nationalist, internationalism is a lie. Many insist that one can be a nationalist and at the same time be of no nation: this is an impossibility and only a trick of the mind.

To be attached to one particular piece of earth prevents the love of the whole. Having created a false and unnatural problem of nationalism, we proceed to solve it through clever and complex arguments for the necessity of nationalism and its maintenance through armaments, hate and division. All such answers must be utterly stupid and false, for the problem itself is an illusion and a perversion. Let us understand this question of nationalism, and in this respect at least let us remain sane in a world of brutal regimentation and insanity.

Is not the organized love of one's country, with its regimented hate and affection, cultivated and imposed through propaganda, through leaders, merely a vested interest? Does not this so-called love of one's country exist because it feeds one's own egotism through devious ways? All enforcement and gratification must inevitably create mechanical habits which must constantly come into conflict with one's own integrity and affections. Prejudice, hate, fear, must create division, which inevitably breeds war; war not only within oneself, but also between peoples.

If nationalism is merely a habit, what is one to do? Not having a passport does not make you free of the nationalistic habit. Mere super-

Now let us take another example of the process of the habit-forming mechanism which destroys creative living. You must be made new to understand reality.

Take the question of the way we treat people. Have you noticed how you yourself treat people—one whom you think to be superior, with great consideration, and the inferior with offensive contempt and indifference? Have you noticed it? (*Yes*) It is obvious in this Camp; the way you treat me and the way you treat one of your fellow campers or those who help in running the Camp; the way you behave to a titled person, and to a commoner; the respect you pay to money, and the respect you do not pay to the poor, and so on. Is not this the result of mere habit, of tradition, of imitation, of the desire to succeed, the habit of gratifying one's own vanity?

Please just think about this and perceive how the mind lives and continues in habit, though it is asserting that it must be spontaneous, free. What is the good of your listening to me if the obvious thing is escaping your consideration? Again you are silent, because this is a common event in your lives, and so you are a bit nervous of approaching it for you do not want to be exposed too radically.

If this habit exists—and it is merely a habit and not a deliberate, conscious action except in the case of a few—when you become conscious of it, it will disappear, if you really love this whole process of living. But if you are not interested, you will listen to me, and you may be intellectually excited for a few minutes, but you will continue in the same old manner. But those of you who are deeply interested, who love to understand truth, to you I say, observe how this or any other habit creates a chain of memories which becomes more and more strong, till there is only the "I," the "me." This mechanism is the "I," and as long as this process exists there cannot be the ecstasy of love, of truth.

Let us take another example, that of meditation. Now I see you are beginning to take interest. Nationalism, the way we treat people, love, meditation—all these are part of the same process; they all spring from the one source, but we are examining each separately to understand them better.

Perhaps you will talk over with me this question of meditation, for most of you, in one way or another, practise this thing called meditation, don't you? (*Yes and No*) Some do; some do not. Those of you who do, why do you do it? And those of you who do not, why don't you? Those who do not meditate, what is their motive? Either their attitude is one of complete thoughtlessness, indifference, or they are afraid of becoming involved in all this rubbish, or they fear to reveal themselves

to themselves, or there is the fear of acquiring new and inconvenient habits, and so on. Those who do meditate, what is their motive?

Questioner: Egotism.

Krishnamurti: Are you putting forward this word as an explanation? I can give you also a very good explanation, but we are trying to go beyond mere explanations. Mere explanations usually put a stop to thinking. What are we trying to do in talking this matter over? We are exposing ourselves. We are helping each other to see what we are. You are acting as a mirror to me, and I as a mirror to you, without distortion. But if you merely give an explanation, just throw off a few words, you cloud the mirror, which prevents clear perception.

We are trying to find out why we meditate, and what it means. Those of you who meditate, you do it presumably because you feel that you need a certain poise and clarity, through self-recollectedness, to deal with the problems of life. So you set aside some time for this purpose and you hope during this period to come into contact with something real, which will help to guide you during the day. Is this not so? (Yes) During this period you begin to discipline yourself, or during the whole day you discipline your thoughts and feelings, and so your actions, according to the established pattern of those few moments of so-called meditation.

Questioner: No, I consider it a step on the pathway to the liberation of the self, a footstep only.

Krishnamurti: Surely you are saying the same thing as I am pointing out, only you put it in your own words. Through discipline can you liberate thought, liberate emotion? This is the point which the questioner raises. Can one discipline oneself in order to become spontaneous, to comprehend the unknown, the real? Discipline implies a pattern, a mould which is shaping, and that which is truth must be the unknown and cannot be approached by the known.

Questioner: I think I meditate because I want to know myself, because I am afraid of myself, because I hate myself as I hate my neighbour, and I want to know myself to protect myself. I hate my neighbour, and I love him. I hate him because he threatens my habits, my well-being. I love him because I want him. And I am a nationalist because I am afraid of those across the frontier. I protect myself in every way possible.

Krishnamurti: You are saying that you meditate in order to protect yourself. (Yes) That is so, but we should go more deeply into this question of discipline, not only the discipline imposed by the outside world through various institutions of organized morality, through particular social systems, but also the discipline that desire develops.

Discipline imposed from without, by society, by leaders, and so on, must inevitably destroy individual fulfilment; I think this is fairly obvious. For such discipline, compulsion, conformity, merely postpones the inevitable problem of the individual fear with its many illusions.

Now there are many reasons for disciplining oneself; there is the desire to protect oneself in various ways, by achievement, by trying to become wiser, nobler, by finding the Master, by becoming more virtuous, by following principles, ideals, by wanting and craving for truth, for love, and so on. All this indicates the working of fear, and the noble reasons are but the coverings of this innate fear.

You say to yourself: "In order to reach God, to find out reality, to put myself in communion with the Absolute, with the Cosmic"—you know all the phrases—"I must begin to discipline myself. I must learn to be more concentrated. I must practise awareness, develop certain virtues." When you are asserting these things and disciplining yourself, what is happening to your thoughts and emotions?

Questioner: Do you mean it is a form of self-glorification?

Questioner: We are forming habits.

Krishnamurti: Suppose one conceives a pattern of what is good, or it has been imposed through tradition, education, or one has learnt that evil is that which divides; and if this is the ideal, the pattern for life's conduct that one pursues through meditation, through self-imposed discipline, then what is happening to one's own thoughts and emotions? One is forcing them, violently or lovingly, to conform, and thereby establishing a new habit instead of the old. Is this not so? (Yes)

Thus intellect, will, is controlling and shaping morality; will based on the desire to protect oneself. The desire to protect oneself is born of fear, which denies reality. The way of discipline is the process of fear, and the habit created by so-called meditation destroys spontaneity, the revelation of the unknown.

Questioner: Is it not possible to form a habit of love without losing spontaneity?

Krishnamurti: Habit is of the mind, of the will, which merely overcomes fear without doing away with it. Emotions are creative, vital, new, and therefore cannot be made into a habit however much the will tries to dominate and control them.

It is the mind, the will, with its attachments, desires, fears, that creates conflict between itself and emotion. Love is not the cause of misery; it is the fears, desires, habits of the mind that create pain, the agony of jealousy, disillusionment. Having created conflict and suffering, the mind with its will for satisfaction finds reasons, excuses, escapes, which are called by various names—detachment, impersonal love, and

so on. We must understand the whole process of the habit-forming mechanism, and not ask which discipline, pattern or ideal is best. If discipline is co-ordination, then it is not to be realized through enforcement, through any system. The individual must comprehend his own profound complexity and not merely look to a pattern for fulfilment.

Do not practise discipline, follow patterns and mere ideals, but be aware of the process of forming habits. Be conscious of the old grooves along which the mind has run and also of the desire to create new ones. Seriously experiment with this; perhaps there will be greater confusion and suffering, for discipline, moral laws, have merely acted to hold down the hidden desires and purposes. When you are aware integrally, with your whole being, of this confusion and suffering, without any hope of escape, then there will arise spontaneously that which is real. But you must love, be enthused by that very confusion and suffering. You must love with your own heart, not with another's.

If you begin to experiment with yourself, you will see a curious transformation taking place. In the moment of highest confusion there is clarity; in the moment of greatest fear there is love. You must come to it spontaneously, without the exertion of will

I suggest seriously that you experiment with what I have been saying and then you will begin to see in what manner habit destroys creative perception. But it is not a thing to be wished for and cultivated. There cannot be a groping after it.

III

I have been trying to explain what is the right inward condition in which one can truly be oneself; that so long as the habit-forming mechanism exists one cannot truly be oneself, even if it is considered good. All habit must prevent clarity of perception and must conceal one's own integrity. This mechanism has been developed as a means of escape, a process of concealment, of covering up one's own confusion and uncertainties; it has been developed to cover up the futility of one's own actions and the routine of work, of occupation; or to escape from emptiness, sorrow, disappointment, and so on.

We are trying to escape, run away from ignorance and fear, through forming habits that will counteract them, that will resist them—habits of ideals and morality. When there is discontentment, sorrow, the intellect mechanically comes forward with solutions, explanations, tentative

suggestions, which gradually crystallize and become habits of thought. Thus suffering and doubt are covered over.

So fear is the root of this habit-forming mechanism. We must understand its process. By understanding I do not mean the mere intellectual grasp of it, but the becoming aware of it as an actual process that is taking place, not superficially, but as something that is happening every day of one's life. Understanding is a process of self-revelation, of being aware not merely objectively, mechanically, but as a part of our very existence.

To understand this mechanism of escape through habit, we must first find out the concealed motive—the motive that drives us to certain actions, which brings in its wake what we call experience. As long as we do not understand the motive power of this mechanism that creates escape, merely to consider the escapes is of little value.

Experience is a process of accumulation and denudation, of revelation and a strengthening of old habits, a breaking down and building up of that which we call the will. Experience either strengthens the will or at moments destroys it; either builds up purposive desires, or breaks those desires we have stored up, only to create new ones. In this process of experiencing, living, there is the gradual formation of will.

Now there is no divine will, but only the plain, ordinary will of desire: the will to succeed, to be satisfied, to be. This will is a resistance, and it is the fruit of fear which guides, chooses, justifies, disciplines. This will is not divine. It is not in conflict with the so-called divine will, but because of its very existence it is a source of sorrow and conflict, for it is the will of fear. There cannot be conflict between light and darkness; where the one is, the other is not. However much we may like to clothe this will with divinity, with high-sounding principles and names, will in its essence is the result of fear, of desire.

Some are aware of this will of fear, with all its permutations and combinations. Perhaps some realize this will as fear and attempt to break it down by pursuing it along its many expressions, thus only creating another form of will, breaking down one resistance only to create another.

So before we begin to inquire into the ways and means of breaking down fear through discipline, through forming new habits, and so on, we must first understand the motive power that lies behind the will. I have explained what I mean by understanding. This understanding is not an intellectual, analytical process. It is not of the drawing-room or of the specialist, but has to be understood in everyday actions, in our daily relationships. That is, the process of living will reveal to us, if we are awake at all, the functioning of this will, of this habit, the

vicious circle of creating one resistance after another, which we can call by different names—ideals, love, God, truth, and so forth.

The motive power behind the will is fear, and when we begin to realize this, the mechanism of habit intervenes, offering new escapes, new hopes, new gods. Now it is at this precise moment, when the mind begins to interfere with the realization of fear, that there must be great awareness not to be drawn off, not to be distracted by the offerings of the intellect, for the mind is subtle and cunning. When there is only fear without any hope of escape, in its darkest moments, in the utter solitude of fear, there comes from within itself, as it were, the light which shall dispel it.

Whatever attempts we make superficially, intellectually, to destroy fear through various forms of discipline, behaviour patterns, only create other forms of resistances; and it is in this habit that we are caught. When you ask how to get rid of fear, how to break down habits, you are really approaching it from outside, intellectually, and so your question has no significance. You cannot dissolve fear through will, for will is the child of fear; nor can it be destroyed through "love," for if love is used for the purposes of destruction it is no longer love but another name for will.

Questioner: Please, what is samadhi? Those who have reached it maintain that it is a true realization. Is it not, on the contrary, only a kind of suicide, the final result of an artificial way? Is there not an absolute lack of all creative activity? You point out the necessity of being oneself, whereas this is a mere killing of oneself, is it not?

Krishnamurti: Any process that leads to limitation, to resistance, to cutting oneself off, as it were, in an intellectual or an ideal state, is destructive of creative living. Surely this is obvious. That is, if one has an ideal of love—and all ideals must be intellectual and therefore mechanical—and one tries to practise it, make love into a habit, one reaches certainly a definite state. But it is not that of love, it is only a state of an intellectual achievement.

This pursuit of the ideal is attempted by all peoples; the Hindus do it in their way, and the Christians and other religious bodies also do it. Fear creates the ideal, the pattern, the principle, for the mind is pursuing satisfaction. When this satisfaction is threatened the mind escapes to the ideal. Fear, having created the pattern, moulds thought and desire, gradually destroying spontaneity, the unknown, the creative.

Questioner: The greatest fear I have is that the life of another, or my own, should be spoilt.

Krishnamurti: Is not each one, in his own way, "spoiling his own life? Are we not destroying our own integrity? By our own desires,

but during the process of getting there the mind becomes weary and has acquired knowledge, formulas, standards, which really stand in the way of its understanding the one central problem. Some of us try to trace each problem to its source, and in the process of examination and analysis we are learning, we are accumulating so-called knowledge. This knowledge gradually becomes formulas, patterns. Experience has given us memories and values which guide and discipline and which must inevitably condition.

Now it is these self-protective standards and memories, this stored-up knowledge, these formulas, that prevent us from grasping the fundamental problem and solving it. If we are confronted with a vital experience and try to understand it with dead memories, values, we merely pervert it, absorbing it into the dead accumulation of the past.

To solve this problem of living you must have a fresh, new mind. A new birth must take place. Life, love, reality are ever new, and a fresh mind and heart are needed to understand them. Love is ever new, but this freshness is spoilt by the mechanical intellect with its complexities, anxieties, jealousies, and so on.

Are we made anew, is there a new birth each day? Or are we merely developing the capacity of resistance through will, through habit, through values?

We are merely strengthening the will of resistance in different and subtle forms. So experience, instead of liberating us, giving us freedom to be reborn, to be made anew, is further conditioning us, further binding us to the dead accumulations of the past, to the stored-up knowledge, which is really ignorance and fear. This perverts and destroys the liberating force of experience.

This is the fundamental problem—how to be reborn or made anew. Now can you be made anew through formulas, through beliefs? Is it not absurd, the very idea that you can be made anew by patterns, ideals, standards? Can discipline, enforced or self-imposed, bring about a rebirth of the mind? This also is an impossibility, is it not? Through slogans, repetitive words, institutions, through the worship of another, can you be made anew? Perhaps momentarily, while you are listening to me, you feel the impossibility of being made anew through a method, through a person, and so on.

Then what will make us anew? Do you perceive the vital necessity of being renewed, of being reborn? To understand life with all its complex problems, and reality, the unknown, there must be a constant death and a new birth. Otherwise you meet new problems, new experiences, with dead accumulations, which only bind, causing confusion and suffering.

We are, then, confronted with these accumulated memories and formulas, beliefs and values, which are constantly acting as a shield, as

a resistance. Now if we try to remove these resistances, these safeguards, merely through will, discipline, the mind is not being made anew. And yet we have the power, the only force which can liberate and which can make anew, and that is love—the love, not of the ideal, not of the formula, but the love of man and man. But we have hedged this love about with the morality of the will because there is the desire for satisfaction, and its fear. So love becomes destructive, binding, instead of liberating, renewing.

We see this process of bondage and pain in our daily life. It is only in daily life, with its relationships and its conflicts, its fears and its ambitions, that you begin to perceive the renewing force of love. This love is not sentiment. Sentiment, after all, is merely the incapacity to feel deeply, integrally, and therefore to alter fundamentally.

Questioner: I should like to know why I am sometimes too lazy to be fresh and new?

Krishnamurti: You may be lazy because of the lack of proper diet, but possessing a healthy body, does that ensure a rebirth of the mind? You may be quiet, apparently lazy, and yet be extraordinarily alive.

Questioner: To be made anew we must exert ourselves.

Krishnamurti: You cannot be made anew with the dead weight of the past, and perceiving this you think you must make an effort to get rid of it. Being caught in confusion, you feel that to become disentangled from it you must discipline yourself, you must make an effort to overcome it, or otherwise confusion will increase and continue. This is what you mean, isn't it? Either you make an effort to keep still and observe in order to find ways and means of overcoming this confusion and conflict, or you make an effort to see its causes so that you may overcome them; or you are intellectually interested only to observe—but we need not be concerned with the so-called intellectuals. Either you accept the chaos, the struggle, or you try to overcome suffering; both involve effort. If you examine the motive for this exertion you will perceive that there is the desire not to suffer, the desire to escape, to be satisfied, to protect oneself, and so on. Effort is being made to overcome, to understand, to transform that which we are into that which we want to be or think we ought to be. Does not all such effort really produce a series of new habits instead of the old? The old habits, the old values have not given you the ideal, the satisfaction, and so you make an effort to establish new ideals, a new series of habits and values and satisfactions. Such effort is considered worthy and noble. You are making an effort to be or not to be something, according to a preconceived formula, pattern. So there cannot be a rebirth, but only a continuation of the

by our own conditionings, we are spoiling our own individual lives. Having control of another, and having the capacity to spoil our own life, we proceed to twist the life of another, whether it is a child, a dependent, or a neighbour.

There are institutions, governmental and religious, to which we are willingly or unwillingly forced to conform. So to which kind of spoiling does the questioner refer? The deliberate perversion of one's own life, or the twisting of one's life by powerful institutions? Our natural reaction is to say that institutions, great and small, are corrupting our lives. One's reaction is to put the blame on the outer, on circumstances.

To put it in a different way, here we are in a world of regimentation, of compulsion, of the clever technique of governments and organized religions to wear down the individual—and what is one to do? How is an individual to act? I wonder how many of you have seriously put this question to yourselves. Some may have realized the brutality of all this and joined societies or groups which promise to alter certain conditions. But in the process of alteration, the organization of the party, of the society, has grown to vast proportions and has become of the greatest importance. So the individual is again caught in its machinery.

How are we to approach this question? From the outside or from within? There is no division as the outer and the inner, but merely changing the outer cannot fundamentally alter the inner. If you are aware that you are spoiling your own life, how can you look to an institution, or to an outward pattern to help you?

If you deeply feel that violence in any form can only lead to violence, though you may not stop wars you will at least be a centre of sanity, as a doctor in the midst of disease. So in the same way, if you integrally perceive in what manner you are spoiling your life, that very perception begins to straighten out those things that are crooked. Such an action is not an escape.

Questioner: Must we return to the past? Must I be aware of what I have been? Must I know my karma?

Krishnamurti: By being aware, both the past and the present are revealed, which is not some mysterious process, but in trying to understand the present, the past fears and limitations are revealed.

Karma is a Sanskrit word whose verb means to act. A philosophy of action has been created around the central idea "As you sow, so shall you reap," but we need not go into all that now. We see that any action born of the idea of reward or of punishment must be limiting, for such action springs from fear. Action brings either clarity or confusion, depending on one's conditioning. If one is brought up to worship success, either here or in the so-called spiritual sphere, there must be the,

pursuit of reward with its fears and hopes, which conditions all action, all living. Living becomes then a process of learning, of the constant accumulation of knowledge. Why do we lay up this so-called knowledge?

Questioner: Are we not to have in ourselves some standard for action?

Krishnamurti: Now we come to the fundamental question: Must one live by standards, whether outer or inner? We easily recognize the outer standard as one of compulsion and therefore preventing individual fulfilment. We look to an inner standard which each one has created through action and reaction, through judgment of values, desires, experiences, fears, and so on. What is this inner standard based upon, though it is constantly varying? Is it not based upon self-protective desire and its many fears? These desires and fears create a pattern of behaviour, of morality, and fear is the constant standard, assuming different forms under different conditions. There are those who take shelter in the intellectual formula "Life is one," and others in the love of God, which is also an intellectual formula, and they make these into patterns, principles, for their daily life. Morality of will is not moral but the expression of fear.

but during the process of getting there the mind becomes weary and has acquired knowledge, formulas, standards, which really stand in the way of its understanding the one central problem. Some of us try to trace each problem to its source, and in the process of examination and analysis we are learning, we are accumulating so-called knowledge. This knowledge gradually becomes formulas, patterns. Experience has given us memories and values which guide and discipline and which must inevitably condition.

Now it is these self-protective standards and memories, this stored-up knowledge, these formulas, that prevent us from grasping the fundamental problem and solving it. If we are confronted with a vital experience and try to understand it with dead memories, values, we merely pervert it, absorbing it into the dead accumulation of the past.

To solve this problem of living you must have a fresh, new mind. A new birth must take place. Life, love, reality are ever new, and a fresh mind and heart are needed to understand them. Love is ever new, but this freshness is spoilt by the mechanical intellect with its complexities, anxieties, jealousies, and so on.

Are we made anew, is there a new birth each day? Or are we merely developing the capacity of resistance through will, through habit, through values?

We are merely strengthening the will of resistance in different and subtle forms. So experience, instead of liberating us, giving us freedom to be reborn, to be made anew, is further conditioning us, further binding us to the dead accumulations of the past, to the stored-up knowledge, which is really ignorance and fear. This perverts and destroys the liberating force of experience.

This is the fundamental problem—how to be reborn or made anew. Now can you be made anew through formulas, through beliefs? Is it not absurd, the very idea that you can be made anew by patterns, ideals, standards? Can discipline, enforced or self-imposed, bring about a rebirth of the mind? This also is an impossibility, is it not? Through slogans, repetitive words, institutions, through the worship of another, can you be made anew? Perhaps momentarily, while you are listening to me, you feel the impossibility of being made anew through a method, through a person, and so on.

Then what will make us anew? Do you perceive the vital necessity of being renewed, of being reborn? To understand life with all its complex problems, and reality, the unknown, there must be a constant death and a new birth. Otherwise you meet new problems, new experiences, with dead accumulations, which only bind, causing confusion and suffering.

We are, then, confronted with these accumulated memories and formulas, beliefs and values, which are constantly acting as a shield, as

a resistance. Now if we try to remove these resistances, these safeguards, merely through will, discipline, the mind is not being made anew. And yet we have the power, the only force which can liberate and which can make anew, and that is love—the love, not of the ideal, not of the formula, but the love of man and man. But we have hedged this love about with the morality of the will because there is the desire for satisfaction, and its fear. So love becomes destructive, binding, instead of liberating, renewing.

We see this process of bondage and pain in our daily life. It is only in daily life, with its relationships and its conflicts, its fears and its ambitions, that you begin to perceive the renewing force of love. This love is not sentiment. Sentiment, after all, is merely the incapacity to feel deeply, integrally, and therefore to alter fundamentally.

Questioner: I should like to know why I am sometimes too lazy to be fresh and new?

Krishnamurti: You may be lazy because of the lack of proper diet, but possessing a healthy body, does that ensure a rebirth of the mind? You may be quiet, apparently lazy, and yet be extraordinarily alive.

Questioner: To be made anew we must exert ourselves.

Krishnamurti: You cannot be made anew with the dead weight of the past, and perceiving this you think you must make an effort to get rid of it. Being caught in confusion, you feel that to become disentangled from it you must discipline yourself, you must make an effort to overcome it, or otherwise confusion will increase and continue. This is what you mean, isn't it? Either you make an effort to keep still and observe in order to find ways and means of overcoming this confusion and conflict, or you make an effort to see its causes so that you may overcome them; or you are intellectually interested only to observe—but we need not be concerned with the so-called intellectuals. Either you accept the chaos, the struggle, or you try to overcome suffering; both involve effort. If you examine the motive for this exertion you will perceive that there is the desire not to suffer, the desire to escape, to be satisfied, to protect oneself, and so on. Effort is being made to overcome, to understand, to transform that which we are into that which we want to be or think we ought to be. Does not all such effort really produce a series of new habits instead of the old? The old habits, the old values have not given you the ideal, the satisfaction, and so you make an effort to establish new ideals, a new series of habits and values and satisfactions. Such effort is considered worthy and noble. You are making an effort to be or not to be something, according to a preconceived formula, pattern. So there cannot be a rebirth, but only a continuation of the

old desire in a new form which soon creates confusion and sorrow. Again there is the exertion of the will to overcome this conflict and pain; one is again caught up in the vicious circle of effort, whether it is the effort to find the cause of suffering or the effort to overcome it.

Effort is made to overcome fear through discovering its causes. Why do you want to discover the cause? Is it not because you do not want to suffer, you are afraid to suffer? So you hope that, through fear yielding to fear, all fear will be overcome. This is an impossibility.

Now do you make an effort to discover the cause of joy? If you do, then joy ceases to be and only its memories and habits exist.

Questioner: So by analyzing, fear should also disappear in the same way that pleasure does when examined. But why does it not?

Krishnamurti: Joy is spontaneous, unsought and uninvited, and, when the mind analyzes it to cultivate or to recapture it, then it is no longer joy. Whereas fear is not spontaneous except in sudden, unforeseen incidents, but it is sedulously cultivated by the mind in its desire for satisfaction, for certainty. So if you make an effort to get rid of fear by discovering its causes, and so on, you are merely covering up fear, for effort is of the will, which is resistance created by fear.

If you integrally, with your whole being, understand this process, then in the midst of this flame of suffering, when there is no desire to escape, to overcome, out of this very confusion there arises a new comprehension spontaneously springing up out of the soil of fear itself.

V

I have tried to explain that renewal, rebirth, must be spontaneous and not the result of effort.

Before finding out if effort is moral or immoral, important or unimportant, we must first consider desire. In understanding desire, each one will discover for himself whether effort is moral or immoral with regard to the renewal, the rebirth of the mind. If one had no desire, there would be no effort. So we must know its process, the motive power behind effort, which is always desire; by whatever name you like to call it, righteousness, the good, the God in us, the higher self, and so on, nevertheless it is still desire.

Now desire is always for something; it is always dependent and therefore always productive of fear. In being dependent there is always

uncertainty which breeds fear. Desire cannot exist by itself, it must always be in relation to something. You can observe this in your daily, psychological reactions. Desire is always dependent, related to something. It is only love which is not dependent.

There is the desire to be something, to become, to succeed, not to suffer, to find happiness, to love and to be loved, to find truth, reality, God. There is the positive desire to be something, and the negative desire not to be something. If we are attached there is agony, suffering, and from that we learn—what we call learn—that attachment gives pain. So we desire not to be attached, and cultivate that negative quality, detachment. Desire is prompting us to be this and not that.

We are familiar with the positive and the negative desire, to be and not to be, to become and not to become. Now desire is not emotion; desire is the result of a mind that is ever seeking satisfaction, whose values are based on satisfaction. To be satisfied is the motive behind all desire. The mind is ever seeking satisfaction at any cost, and if it is thwarted in one direction it seeks to achieve its purpose in another. All effort, all directive power of the mind, is that it may be satisfied. So satisfaction becomes a mechanical habit of the mind. In moments of great emotion, of deep love, there is no dependency of desire, nor its search for satisfaction.

To be satisfied, the mind develops its own technique of resistance and non-resistance, which is the will. And when the mind discovers that in the process of satisfaction there is suffering, then it begins to develop desirelessness, detachment. Thus there is the positive and the negative will ever exerting, ever seeking satisfaction. The desire to be satisfied creates will, which maintains itself by its own continual effort. And where will is, there must always follow fear—fear of not being satisfied, of not achieving, of not becoming. Will and fear always go together. And again to overcome this fear, effort is made, and in this vicious circle of uncertainty the mind is caught. Will and fear go always hand in hand, and will maintains its continuity from satisfaction to satisfaction, through memory which gives to consciousness its continuity, as the "I."

Will and effort, then, is merely the mechanism of the mind to be satisfied. Thus desire is wholly of the mind. Mind is the very essence of desire. Habit is established by constant search for satisfaction, and the sensation which the mind stimulates is not emotion.

All effort then, springing from the will either to be satisfied or not to be satisfied, must ever be mechanical, habit-forming, and so cannot bring about rebirth, renewal. Even when the mind inquires into the cause of suffering, it is doing so primarily because it desires to escape, to do away with that which is not satisfactory and to gain that which is.

Now this whole process in which the mind is caught up is the way

of ignorance. Will, that is maintaining itself through effort to be satisfied, to be gratified, through various ways and methods—this will of satisfaction must of its own accord cease, for any effort to put an end to satisfaction is only another way of being satisfied.

So this process of satisfaction, of gratification, is continually going on and all effort can only give strength to it. Perceiving that all effort is the desire for satisfaction and therefore of fear itself, how is one to bring this process to an end? Even this very desire for its cessation is born of the will to be satisfied. This very question of how to be free of desire is prompted by desire itself.

If you feel integrally this whole process as ignorance, then you will not ask for a way to be free from desire, fear. Then you will not seek any method, however promising, however hopeful. There is no method, no system, no path to truth. When you understand the full inward significance of all methods, that very comprehension is beginning spontaneously to dissolve desire, fear, which is seeking satisfaction.

Only in deep emotion is there no craving for satisfaction. Love is not dependent on satisfaction and habit. But the will of desire ever seeks to make of love a mechanical habit, or tries to control it through moral laws, through compulsion, and so on. Hence there is a constant battle by the mind, with its will of satisfaction, to control, dominate love; and the battle is almost always won by the mind, for love has no conflict within itself and so with another. Only when desire, with its will of fear, ceases of its own spontaneous accord—not through compulsion or the promise of reward—is there a renewal, a rebirth of one's whole being.

Questioner: Can I trust or have faith in this love, or is this also a way of self-protection?

Krishnamurti: Is not faith another refuge in which mind takes satisfaction and shelter? You may have faith in love, another in God, and so on. All such faith is an anchorage for the mind. Any refuge, any attachment, whatever its name, must be one of self-protection, satisfaction, and therefore the result of fear.

One perceives appalling cruelty about one, utter chaos and barbarity, and one takes refuge in an ideal, in belief, or in some form of consolation. Thus one escapes into an illusion; but the conflict between the actual and the illusory must continue till either the unreal overcomes the actual or the actual breaks through all safeguards, all escapes, and begins to reveal its deep significance.

Questioner: By merely insisting on individual fulfilment are you not putting aside the social question? How can the individual, who is

ever in relation with society, be the only important factor? Why do you emphasize the individual?

Krishnamurti: Without the individual, society cannot exist; this social entity is not independent of the individual. Society is the relationship of one individual with another. Society is personal but it has become an independent machine with a life of its own which merely uses the individual. Society has become merely an institution which controls and dominates the individual through opinion, moral laws, vested interests, and so on. As institutions are never important but only the individual, we must consider his fulfilment, which cannot be brought about by mere change of environment, however drastic the change may be. The mere alteration of the superficial will not bring about the deep fulfilment of man, but only mechanical reactions. This division as the individual and the environment is mechanical and false; when fundamentally each one understands this to be so, then the individual will act integrally, not as an individual nor as merely the mechanical product of a society, but as an integrate human being.

Questioner: This surely will take many centuries, will it not? So must we not make new social laws and conditions now?

Krishnamurti: How are we going to bring about this change which we all desire? Either through force, or each individual beginning to awaken to the necessity of fundamental change. Either through enforcement, revolution, domination, or through the awakening of the individual to reality.

If we want to produce a merely mechanical world of moral systems, laws, impositions, then violence may be sufficient, force of every description; but if we want peace and brotherhood, relationship based on love, then violence in any form cannot be the way. Through violence you cannot come to peace, to love, but only to further violence. Violence is complex and subtle, and until the individual is free from its obvious and its hidden domination, there cannot be peace nor lasting brotherhood.

Questioner: Then must we let cruel people go on being cruel?

Krishnamurti: To save humanity, must you first destroy the human? Is that what you are asking me? Because you have certain ideologies, certain beliefs, must the individual be sacrificed to them? No, my friends, we do not want to help the world, we only want to impose on others a certain ideology, a certain faith, a certain belief. We want the tyranny of ideas to prevail, and not love.

Each one is pursuing his own particular problem, or his own ideal of man, or his own conception of the State, or his belief in God, and so on. But if you who are listening to me fundamentally grasp what

I am saying, then you will be concerned with the root problem, that of desire with its fears and efforts, which prevents individual fulfilment, rebirth.

VI

I have been trying to explain the habit-forming mechanism of fear, which destroys renewal, rebirth, in which alone there can be reality. The desire for satisfaction creates fear and habit. As I explained, desire and emotion are two different and distinct processes; desire being entirely of the mind, and emotion the integral expression of one's whole being. Desire, the process of the mind, is ever accompanied by fear, and emotion is devoid of fear. Desire must ever produce fear, and emotion has no fear at any time for it is of one's whole being. Emotion cannot conquer desire, for emotion is a state of fearlessness which can be experienced only when desire, with its fear and will of satisfaction, ceases. Emotion cannot overcome fear; for fear, as desire, is of the mind. Emotions are wholly of a different character, quality and dimension.

Now what we are trying to do, the majority of us, is to overcome fear either by desire or by what we call "emotion"—which is really another form of desire. You cannot overcome fear by love. To overcome fear through another force which we call emotion, love, is not possible, for the desire to overcome fear is born of desire itself, of the mind itself, and is not of love. That is, fear is the result of desire, satisfaction, and the desire to overcome fear is of the nature of satisfaction itself. It is not possible to overcome fear by love, as most people find out for themselves. Mind, which is of desire, cannot destroy part of itself. This is what you try to do when you talk of "getting rid" of fear. When you ask, "How am I to get rid of fear, what am I to do about the various forms of fear?" you are merely wanting to know how to overcome one set of desires by another—which only perpetuates fear. For all desire creates fear. Desire breeds fear, and in trying to overcome one desire by another you are only yielding to fear. Desire can only re-condition itself, reshape itself to a new pattern, but it will still be desire, giving birth to fear.

We know that our present habits of thought and morality are based on individual security and gain and that thus we have created a society which is maintained through our own desire. Realizing this, there are

those who try to create new habits, new virtues, in the hope of creating a new society based on non-gain, and so on. But desire still persists in different forms, and, until we realize the whole process of desire itself, the mere transformation of outside conditions, values, will have little significance.

To change the form of desire from the old to the new is merely to re-condition the mind, for it will still be of desire and thus it will always be a source of fear. So we must understand the process of the mind itself. Is not the mind, as we know it, an instrument developed for survival, for satisfaction, for self-protection, for resistance, and therefore the instrument of fear? Let us put aside the consideration that the mind is the instrument of God, the highest moral guide, and so on, for all such assumptions are merely traditional or are mere hopes. Mind is essentially an instrument of fear. From desire spring reason, conclusion, action—whose values and moralities are based on the will to survive, to be satisfied. Thus the mind, thought, breaks itself up into many parts, as the conscious and the unconscious, the high and the low, the real and the false, the good and the evil. That is, the mind, seeking satisfaction, has broken itself up into many parts, each part being in conflict with the other, but the central and essential pursuit of each part and of the whole is one of self-satisfaction, under different forms. So the mind is ever engendering its own fear.

There are various forms of fear: fear of one's own future, fear of death, of life, of responsibility, and so forth. So the mind is ever trying to make itself secure through beliefs, hopes, illusions, knowledge, ideals, patterns. There is a constant struggle between the known and the unknown. The known is the past, the accumulated, habit, and the unknown is that which is the uncertain, the unconquerable, the spontaneous, the creative.

The past is ever trying to overcome the future; habit proceeds to make the unknown into the habitual so that fear may cease. Thus there is the constant conflict of desire, and fear is ever present. The process is to absorb, to be certain, to be satisfied, and when this is not possible, the mind resorts to satisfying explanations, theories, beliefs. Thus death, the unknown, is made into the known; truth, the unconquerable, is made into the attainable.

So the mind is a battlefield of its own desires, fears, values, and whatever effort it makes to destroy fear—that is, to destroy itself—is utterly vain. That part which desires to get rid of fear is ever seeking satisfaction; and that from which it craves to free itself has been in the past a means of satisfaction. Thus satisfaction is trying to get rid of that which has satisfied; fear is trying to overcome that which has been

the instrument of fear. Desire, creating fear in its search for satisfaction, tries to conquer that fear, but desire itself is the cause of fear. Mere desire cannot destroy itself, nor fear overcome itself, and all effort of the mind to rid itself of them is born of desire. Thus the mind is caught in its own vicious circle of effort.

We must understand deeply the inward nature of the mind itself, and this understanding is not born of a day; it needs immense awareness of our whole being. The mind, as I said, is a battlefield of various desires, values, hopes, and any effort on its part to free itself from them can only accentuate the conflict. Struggle exists so long as desire in any form continues; when one desire discriminates against another, one series of values against another, one ideal against another, this conflict must continue. This discriminative power of desire, choice, must cease, and this can happen only when one understands, inwardly feels the blind effort of the intellect. The deep observation of this process, without want, without judgment, without prejudice, and so without desire, is the beginning of that awareness which alone can free the mind of its own destructive fears, habits, illusions.

But with the majority of us the difficulty is to pierce through those forms of emotion which are really the stimulations of desire, fear, for such emotions are destructive of love. They prevent integral awareness.

Questioner: Are desire and interest, as we know them now, the same?

Krishnamurti: If interest is merely the result of desire, to gain, to be satisfied, to succeed, then interest is the same as desire and therefore destructive of creative life.

Questioner: How can I attain the quality of desirelessness without having the desire to attain it?

Krishnamurti: Sir, this is exactly what I have been talking about this morning. Why do you want to attain desirelessness? Is it not because you have found through experience that desire is painful, desire brings fear, desire creates conflict or a success that is cruel? So you crave to be in a state of desirelessness, which can be achieved, but it is of death, for it is merely the result of fear. You want to be free from all fear, and so you make desirelessness the ideal, the pattern to be pursued. But the motive behind that ideal is still desire and so still of fear.

Questioner: Is mind life itself? Because one cannot divide up life as mind and emotion?

Krishnamurti: As I have explained, the mind has merely become an instrument of self-protection of various forms, and it has divided

itself into emotion and thought—not that life has divided it nor that emotions have separated themselves from the mind, but the mind, through its own desires, has broken up itself into different parts. The mind has discovered that by being desireless it will be less prone to suffering. It has learnt through experience, through knowledge, that desirelessness might bring the ultimate comfort, which it hopes is truth, God, and so on. So it makes an effort to be without desire and therefore divides itself into different parts.

Questioner: Is it possible to be without desire when one has a body?

Krishnamurti: What do you say, sir? This is a problem that you have to face, that we all have to face. Mind, as I said, is ever seeking satisfaction through various forms. Necessity has thus become a means of gratification. This expresses itself in many ways—greed, power, position, and so forth. Can one not exist in this world without desire? You will find this out in your daily life. Do not separate needs from desire, which would be a false approach to the understanding of desire. When needs are glorified as a means for self-importance, then desire starts the complex process of ignorance. If you merely emphasize needs, and make a principle of it, you are again approaching the question of desire from a most unintelligent point of view, but if you begin to consider the process of desire itself, which breeds fear and ignorance, then needs will have their significant value.

Questioner: Please give us your views or anything you care to say on the subject of how to bring up children.

Questioner: It is not the child that is the problem; we are the problem.

Krishnamurti: Are you saying that we must first resolve our own problems and then we shall be able to deal with the child? Is this not a very one-sided conception? Is not child education a very complex problem? You want to help the child to grow to its own fullest integral capacity, but as there are not adequate teachers and schools for this purpose, education becomes a problem. You as a parent may have certain definite ideas that will help the child to be intelligently critical and to be spontaneously himself at all times, but unfortunately at school, nationalism, race hatred, leadership, tradition, example, and so on, are inculcated in the child, thus counteracting all that you may be doing at home. So either you have to start a school of your own where prejudices of race, country, examples, religious superstitions, beliefs, are not inculcated in the children—which means that an intelligent human being as a teacher is necessary; and one is rarely found. Or you must send the child to the schools that already exist, hoping for the best, and counteracting at home all the stupid and pernicious things he learns at school,

by helping him to be intelligent and critical. But generally you have not the time to do this, or you have too much money, so you employ nurses to look after your children.

It is a complex problem which each parent must deal with according to his capacity, but unfortunately this is paralyzed by his own fears, superstitions, beliefs.

Questioner: At least we can give the child a right environment at home.

Krishnamurti: Even that is not enough, is it? For the pressure of opinion is very great. A child feels out of it if he does not put on some kind of uniform or carry a wooden gun when the majority of them are doing it. There is the demand of the so-called nation whose government, with its colossal power, forces the individual to a certain pattern, to carry arms, to kill, to die. Then there is the other institution, organized religion, which, through belief, dogma, and so on, equally tries to destroy the individual. Thus the individual is being continually thwarted of his fulfilment.

This is a problem of our whole life, not to be solved through mere explanations and assertions.

Authentic Report of Ten Talks given by

Krishnamurti

OJAI 1944

Authentic Report of Ten Talks given

Krishnamurti

OJAI 1941

Copyright 1947 by Krishnamurti Writings, Inc.
All Rights Reserved

Issued by
KRISHNAMURTI WRITINGS, INC.
Ojai, California, U S A

This edition is printed for distribution in the British Isles
by the London Office of Krishnamurti Writings, Inc.,
29 Park Lane, Wembley, Middlesex

Amidst so much confusion and sorrow it is essential to find creative understanding of ourselves, for without it no relationship is possible. Only through right thinking can there be understanding. Neither leaders nor a new set of values nor a blue print can bring about this creative understanding; only through our own right effort can there be right understanding.

How is it possible then to find this essential understanding? From where shall we start to discover what is real, what is true, in all this conflagration, confusion and misery? Is it not important to find out for ourselves how to think rightly about war and peace, about economic and social conditions, about our relationship to our fellowmen? Surely there is a difference between right thinking and right or conditioned thought. We may be able to produce in ourselves imitatively right thought, but such thought is not right thinking. Right or conditioned thought is uncreative. But when we know how to think rightly for ourselves, which is to be living, dynamic, then it is possible to bring about a new and happier culture.

I would like during these talks to develop what seems to me to be the process of right thinking so that each one of us is truly creative, and not merely enclosed in a series of ideas or prejudices. How shall we then begin to discover for ourselves what is right thinking? Without right thinking there is no possibility of happiness. Without right thinking our actions, our behavior, our affections have no basis. Right thinking is not to be discovered through books, through attending a few talks, or by merely listening to some people's ideas of what right thinking is. Right thinking is to be discovered for ourselves through ourselves.

Right thinking comes with self-knowledge. Without self-knowledge there is no right thinking. Without knowing yourself, what you think and what you feel cannot be true. The root of all understanding lies in understanding yourself. If you can find out what are the causes of your thought-feeling, and from that discovery know how to think feel, then *there is the beginning of understanding.* Without knowing yourself, the accumulation of ideas, the acceptance of beliefs and theories have no basis. Without knowing yourself you will ever be caught in uncertainty, depending on moods, on circumstances. Without knowing yourself fully you cannot think rightly. Surely this is obvious. If I do not know what my motives, my intentions, my background, my private thoughts-feelings are how can I agree or disagree with another? How can I estimate or establish my relationship with another? How can I discover anything

of life if I do not know myself? And to know myself is an enormous task requiring constant observation, meditative awareness.

This is our first task even before the problem of war and peace, of economic and social conflicts, of death and immortality. These questions will arise, they are bound to arise, but in discovering ourselves, in understanding ourselves these questions will be rightly answered. So those who are really serious in these matters must begin with themselves in order to understand the world of which they are a part. Without understanding yourself you cannot understand the whole.

Self-knowledge is the beginning of wisdom. Self-knowledge is cultivated through the individual's search of himself. I am not putting the individual in opposition to the mass. They are not antithetical. You, the individual, are the mass, the result of the mass. In us, as you will discover if you go into it deeply, are both the many and the particular. It is as a stream that is constantly flowing, leaving little eddies and these eddies we call individuality but they are the result of this constant flow of water. Your thoughts-feelings, those mental-emotional activities, are they not the result of the past, of what we call the many? Have you not similar thoughts-feelings as your neighbor?

So when I talk of the individual I am not putting him in opposition to the mass. On the contrary, I want to remove this antagonism. This opposing antagonism between the mass and the you, the individual, creates confusion and conflict, ruthlessness and misery. But if we can understand how the individual, the you, is part of the whole, not only mystically but actually, then we shall free ourselves happily and spontaneously from the greater part of the desire to compete, to succeed, to deceive, to oppress, to be ruthless, or to become a follower or a leader. Then we will regard the problem of existence quite differently. And it is important to understand this deeply. As long as we regard ourselves as individuals, apart from the whole, competing, obstructing, opposing, sacrificing the many for the particular or the particular for the many, all those problems that arise out of this conflicting antagonism will have no happy and enduring solution; for they are the result of wrong thinking-feeling.

Now, when I talk about the individual I am not putting him in opposition to the mass. What am I? I am a result; I am the result of the past, of innumerable layers of the past, of a series of causes-effects. And how can I be opposed to the whole, the past, when I am the result of all that? If I, who am the mass, the whole, if I do not understand myself, not only what is outside my skin, objectively, but subjectively, inside the skin, how can I understand another, the world? To understand oneself requires kindly and tolerant detachment. If you do not understand yourself you will not understand anything else; you may have

great ideals, beliefs and formulations but they will have no reality. They will be delusions. So you must know yourself to understand the present and through the present the past. From the known present the hidden layers of the past are discovered and this discovery is liberating and creative.

To understand ourselves requires—objective, kindly, dispassionate study of ourselves, ourselves being the organism as a whole: our body, our feelings, our thoughts. They are not separate, they are interrelated. It is only when we understand the organism as a whole that we can go beyond and discover still further, greater, vaster things. But without this primary understanding, without laying right foundation for right thinking, we cannot proceed to greater heights.

To bring about in each one of us the capacity to discover what is true becomes essential, for what is discovered is liberating, creative. For what is discovered is true. That is, if we merely conform to a pattern of what we ought to be or yield to a craving, it does produce certain results which are conflicting, confusing, but in the process of our study of ourselves we are on a voyage of self-discovery, which brings joy.

There is a surety in negative rather than positive thinking-feeling. We have assumed in a positive manner what we are, or we have cultivated positively our ideas on other people's or on our own formulations. And hence we depend on authority, on circumstances, hoping thereby to establish a series of positive ideas and actions. Whereas if you examine you will see there is agreement in negation; there is surety in negative thinking which is the highest form of thinking. When once you have found true negation and agreement in negation then you can build further in positiveness.

The discovery that lies in self-knowledge is arduous, for the beginning and the end is in us. To seek happiness, love, hope, outside of us leads to illusion, to sorrow; to find happiness, peace, joy within, requires self-knowledge. We are slaves to the immediate pressures and demands of the world and we are drawn away by all that and dissipate our energies in all that and so we have little time to study ourselves. To be deeply cognizant of our motives, of our desires to achieve, to become, demands constant, inward awareness. Without understanding ourselves superficial devices of economic and social reform, however necessary and beneficial, will not produce unity in the world but only greater confusion and misery.

Many of us think that economic reform of one kind or another will bring peace to the world; or social reform or one specialized religion conquering all others will bring happiness to man. I believe there are something like eight hundred or more religious sects in this country, each competing, proselytizing. Do you think competitive religion will bring peace, unity and happiness to mankind? Do you think any specialized

religion, whether it be Hinduism, Buddhism or Christianity will bring peace? Or must we set aside all specialized religions and discover reality for ourselves? When we see the world blasted by bombs and feel the horrors that are going on in it; when the world is broken up by separate religions, nationalities, races, ideologies, what is the answer to all this? We may not just go on living briefly and dying and hope some good will come out of it. We cannot leave it to others to bring happiness and peace to mankind; for mankind is ourselves, each one of us. Where does the solution lie, except in ourselves? To discover the real answer requires deep thought-feeling and few of us are willing to solve this misery. If each one of us considers this problem as springing from within and is not merely driven helplessly along in this appalling confusion and misery, then we shall find a simple and direct answer.

In studying and so in understanding ourselves there will come clarity and order. And there can be clarity only in self-knowledge which nurtures right thinking. Right thinking comes before right action. If we become self-aware and so cultivate self-knowledge from which springs right thinking, then we shall create a mirror in ourselves which will reflect, without distortion, all our thoughts-feelings. To be so self-aware is extremely difficult as our mind is used to wandering and being distracted. Its wanderings, its distractions are of its own interests and creations. In understanding these—not merely pushing them aside—comes self-knowledge and right thinking. It is only through inclusion, and not by exclusion, not through approbation or condemnation or comparison, that understanding comes.

Questioner: What is my right in my relationship to the world?

Krishnamurti: It is an interesting and instructive question. The questioner seems to put himself in opposition to the world and then asks himself what are his rights in relationship to it. Is he separate from the world? Is he not part of the world? Has he any right apart from the whole? Will he by setting himself apart understand the world? By giving importance to and strengthening the part will he comprehend the whole? The part is not the whole but to understand the whole the part must not set itself in opposition to it. In understanding the part the whole is comprehended. When the individual is in opposition to the world then he claims his rights; but why should he put himself in opposition to it? The attitude of opposition, of the I and the not I, prevents comprehension. Is he not part of the whole? Are not his problems the problems of the world? Are not his conflicts, confusions and miseries those of his neighbor, near or far? When he becomes aware of himself he will know that he is part of the whole. He is the result of the past with its fears, hopes, greeds, aspirations and so on. This result seeks a right

in its relationship to the whole. Has it any right so long as it is envious, greedy, ruthless? It is only when he does not regard himself as an individual but as a result and a part of the whole that he will know that freedom in which there is no opposition, duality. But as long as he is of the world with its ignorance, cruelty, sensuality, then he has no relationship apart from it.

We should not use the word individual at all, nor the words mine and yours because they have no meaning, fundamentally. I am the result of my father and my mother and the environmental influence of the country and society. If I put myself in opposition there is no understanding; the combination of opposites does not produce understanding. But if I become aware and observe the ways of duality then I will begin to feel the new freedom from opposites. The world is divided into the opposites, the white and the dark, the good and the bad, mine and yours and so on. In duality there is no understanding, each antithesis contains its own opposite. Our difficulty lies in thinking of these problems anew, to think of the world and yourself from a different point of view altogether, observing silently, without identifying and comparing. The ideas which you think are the result of what others have thought in combination with the present. Real uniqueness lies in the discovery of what is true and being in that discovery. This uniqueness, joy and liberation which comes from this discovery is not to be found in the pride of possessions, of name, physical attributes and tendencies. True freedom comes through self-knowledge which brings about right thinking; through self-knowledge there is the discovery of the true which alone puts an end to our ignorance and sorrow.

Through self-awareness and self-knowledge peace is found and in that serenity there is immortality.

May 14, 1944

II

Last Sunday I was trying to explain what is right thinking and how to set about it. I said that unless there is self-awareness, self-knowledge of all the motives, intentions and instincts, thought-feeling has no true foundation and that without this foundation there is no right thinking. Self-knowledge is the beginning of understanding. And as we are—the

world is. That is, if we are greedy, envious, competitive, our society will be competitive, envious, greedy, which brings misery and war. The State is what we are. To bring about order and peace, we must begin with ourselves and not with society, not with the State, for the world is ourselves. And it is not selfish to think that each one must first understand and change himself to help the world. You cannot help another unless you know yourself. Through self-awareness one will find that *it* oneself is the whole.

If we would bring about a sane and happy society we must begin with ourselves and not with another, not outside of ourselves, but with ourselves. Instead of giving importance to names, labels, terms—which bring confusion—we ought to rid the mind of these and look at ourselves dispassionately. Until we understand ourselves and go beyond ourselves, exclusiveness in every form will exist. We see about us and in ourselves exclusive desires and actions which result in narrow relationship.

Before we can understand what kind of effort to make in order to know ourselves, we must become aware of the kind of effort we are *now* making. Our effort now consists, does it not, in constant becoming, in escaping from one opposite to another? We live in a series of conflicts of action and response, of wanting and not wanting. Our effort is spent in becoming and not becoming. We live in a state of duality. How does this duality arise? If we can understand this then perhaps we can transcend it and discover a different state of being. How does this painful conflict arise within us between good and bad, hope and fear, love and hate, the I and the not I? Are they not created by our craving to become? This craving expresses itself in sensuality, in worldliness or in seeking personal fame or immortality. In trying to become do we not create the opposite? Unless we understand this conflict of the opposites, all effort will bring about only different and changing sorrowful conditions. So we must use right means to transcend this conflict. Wrong means will produce wrong ends; only right means will produce right ends. If we want peace in the world we must use peaceful methods and yet we seem invariably to use wrong methods hoping to produce right ends.

Unless we understand this problem of opposites with its conflicts and miseries, our efforts will be in vain. Through self-awareness, craving to become, the cause of conflict, must be observed and understood; but understanding ceases if there is identification, if there is acceptance or denial or comparison. With kindly dispassion craving must be deeply understood and so transcended. For a mind that is caught in craving, in duality, cannot comprehend reality. Mind must be extremely still and this stillness cannot be induced, disciplined, compelled through any technique. This stillness comes about only through the understanding

of conflict. And you cannot compel conflict to cease. You cannot by will bring it to an end. You may cover it up, hide it away, but it will come up again and again. A disease must be cured but to treat merely the symptom is of little use. Only when we become aware of the cause of conflict, understand and transcend it, ^{then} can we experience that which is. To become aware is to think out, feel out the opposites as much as you can, as widely and deeply as possible, without acceptance or denial, with choiceless awareness. In this extensional awareness you will find there comes a new kind of will or a new feeling, a new understanding which is not begotten out of the opposites.

Right thinking ceases when thought-feeling is bound, held in the opposites. If you become aware of your thoughts and feelings, your actions and responses, you will find that they are caught in the conflict of opposites. As each thought-feeling arises think it out, feel it out, fully, without identification. This extensional awareness can take place only when you are not denying, when you are not rejecting nor accepting nor comparing. Through this extensional awareness there will be discovered a state of being which is free from the conflict of all opposites.

This creative understanding is to be discovered and it is this understanding which frees the mind from craving. And it is this extensional awareness in which there is no becoming, with its hope and fear, achievement and failure, with its self-enclosing pain and pleasure, that will free thought-feeling from ignorance and sorrow.

Questioner: How is it possible to learn real concentration?

Krishnamurti: In this question many things are involved so one must be patient and listen to the whole of it. What is real meditation? Is it not the beginning of self-knowledge? Without self-knowledge can there be true concentration, right meditation? Meditation is not possible unless you begin to know yourself. To know yourself you must become meditatively aware which requires a peculiar kind of concentration; not the concentration of exclusiveness which most of us indulge in when we think we are meditating. Right meditation is the understanding of oneself, with all one's problems of uncertainty and conflict, misery and affection.

I suppose some of us have meditated or have tried to concentrate. What happens when we are trying to concentrate? Many thoughts come, one after the other, crowding, uninvited. We try to fix our thought upon one object or idea or feeling and try to exclude all other thoughts and feelings. This process of concentration or one-pointedness is generally considered necessary for meditation. This exclusive method will inevitably fail for it maintains the conflict of the opposites; it may

momentarily succeed but as long as duality exists in thought-feeling, concentration must lead to narrowness, obstinacy and illusion.

Control of thought does not bring about right thinking; mere control of thought is not right meditation. Surely we must first find out why the mind wanders at all. It wanders or is repetitive either because of interest or of habit or of laziness or because thought-feeling has not completed itself. If it is of interest then you will not be able to subdue it; though you may succeed momentarily, thought will return to its interests and hence its wanderings. So you must pursue that interest, thinking it out, feeling it out, fully, and thus understand the whole content of that interest* however trivial and stupid. If this wandering is the result of habit then it is very indicative; it indicates, does it not, that your mind is caught up in mere habit, in mere patterns of thought and so is not thinking at all? A mind that is caught up in habit or in laziness indicates that it is functioning mechanically, thoughtlessly, and of what value is thoughtlessness, though well under control? When thought is repetitive then it indicates that thought-feeling has not fulfilled itself and till it has it will go on recurring. Through becoming aware of your thoughts-feelings you will find there is a general disturbance, a stirring up; from the awareness of the causes of disturbance there comes a self-knowledge and right thinking which are the basis for true meditation. Without self-knowledge, self-awareness, there is no meditation, and without meditation there is no self-knowledge.

True concentration comes with self-knowledge. You can create noble fixations and wholly be absorbed in them but this does not bring about understanding. This does not lead to the discovery of the real. It may produce kindness or certain desirable qualities but noble fixations only further strengthen illusion, and a mind that is caught in the opposites cannot understand the whole. Instead of developing the exclusive, contracting process let your thought-feeling flow, understand every flutter, every movement of it. Think it out, feel it out as widely and deeply as possible. Then you will discover that out of this awareness there comes extensional concentration, a meditation which is no longer a becoming but a being. But this extensional awareness is strenuous, to be carried on throughout the day and not only during a set period. You must become strenuous and experiment for it is not to be picked out of books or through attending meetings or following a technique. It comes through self-awareness, through self-knowledge. The real significance of what meditation is becomes of enormous importance. This process of self-awareness is not to be limited to certain periods of the day but to be continuous. Out of this meditative awareness comes deep stillness in which alone there is the real. This stillness of the mind is not the result of exclusiveness, of contraction, of setting aside every thought and

feeling and concentrating on making the mind still. You can enforce stillness on the mind but it is the stillness of death, uncreative, stagnant and in that state it is not possible to discover that which is.

Questioner: How is one to be free from any problem which is disturbing?

Krishnamurti: To understand any problem we must give our undivided attention to it. Both the conscious and the unconscious or the inner mind must take part in solving it, but most of us unfortunately try to dissolve it superficially, that is, with that little part of the mind which we call the conscious mind, with the intellect only. Now our consciousness or our mind-feeling is like an iceberg, the greater part of it hidden deep down, only a fraction of it showing outside. We are acquainted with that superficial layer but it is a confused acquaintance; of the greater, the deep unconscious, the inner part, we are hardly aware. Or, if we are, it becomes conscious through dreams, through occasional intimations but those dreams and hints we translate, interpreting according to our prejudices and to our ever limited intellectual capacities. And so those intimations lose their deep, pure significance.

If we wish to really understand our problem then we must first clear up the confusion in the conscious, in the superficial mind, by thinking and feeling it out as widely and intelligently as possible, comprehensively and dispassionately. Then into this conscious clearing, open and alert, the inner mind can project itself. When the contents of the many layers of consciousness have been thus gathered and assimilated, only then does the problem cease to be.

Let us take an example. Most of us are educated in nationalistic spirit. We are brought up to love our country in opposition to another; to regard our people as superior to another and so on. This superiority or pride is implanted in the mind from childhood and we accept it, live with it and condone it. With that thin layer which we call the conscious mind let us understand this problem and its deeper significance. We accept it first of all through environmental influences and are conditioned by it. Also this nationalistic spirit feeds our vanity. The assertion that we are of this or that race or country feeds our petty, small, poor egos, puffs them out like sails and we are ready to defend, to kill or be maimed for our country, race and ideology. In identifying ourselves with what we consider to be the greater we hope to become greater. But we still remain poor, it is only the label that looms large and powerful. This nationalistic spirit is used for economic purposes and is used, also, through hatred and fear, to unite one people against another. Thus when we become aware of this problem and its implications we perceive its effects: war, misery, starvation, confusion. In

worshipping the part, which is idolatrous, we deny the whole. This denial of human unity breeds endless wars and brutalities, economic and social division and tyranny.

We understand all this intellectually, with that thin layer which we call the conscious mind, but we are still caught up in tradition, opinion, convenience, fear and so on. Until the deep layers are exposed and understood we are not free from the disease of nationalism, patriotism.

Thus in examining this problem we have cleared the superficial layer of the conscious into which the deeper layers can flow. This flow is made stronger through constant awareness: by watching every response, every stimulation of nationalism or of any other hindrance. Each response however small must be thought out, felt out, widely and deeply. Thus you will soon perceive that the problem is dissolved and the nationalistic spirit has withered away. All conflicts and miseries can be understood and dissolved in this manner: to clear the thin layer of the conscious by thinking out and feeling out the problem as comprehensively as possible; into this clarity, into this comparative quietness, the deeper motives, intentions, fears and so on can project themselves; as they appear examine them, study them and so understand them. Thus the hindrance, the conflict, the sorrow is deeply and wholly understood and dissolved.

Questioner: Please elucidate the "surety in negation" idea. You spoke of negative and positive thought. Do you mean when we are positive we make statements that are valueless, because they are tightbound and smug; while when we are negative we are open to thought because we are bankrupt of traditions and able to inquire into the new? Or do you mean we must be positive in that there is no choice between the true and the false and that negation means becoming part of compromise?

Krishnamurti: I said that in negation there is surety. Let us expand this idea. When we become aware of ourselves we find that we are in a state of self-contradiction, of wanting and not wanting, of loving and hating and so on. Thoughts and actions born of this self-contradiction are considered to be positive, but is it positive when thought contradicts itself? Because of our religious training we are certain that we must not kill but we find ourselves supporting or finding reasons for killing when the State demands; one thought denies the other and so there is no thinking at all. In a state of self-contradiction thought ceases and there is only ignorance. So let us discover if we *think* at all or exist in a state of self-contradiction in which thinking ceases to be.

If we look into ourselves we realize that we live in a state of contradiction and how can such a state be positive? For that which contradicts itself ceases to be. Not knowing ourselves profoundly how can there be agreement or disagreement, assertion or denial? In this self-contradic-

tory state how can there be surety? How can we in this state assume that we are right or wrong? We cannot assume anything, can we? But our morality, our positive action is based on this self-contradiction and so we are incessantly active, craving for peace and yet creating war, longing for happiness and yet causing sorrow, loving and yet hating. If our thinking is self-contradictory and therefore non-existent there is only one possible approach for understanding, which is the state of non-becoming, a state which may seem to be negation but in which there is the highest possibility.

Humility is born of negation and without humility there is no understanding. In negative comprehension we begin to perceive the possibility of surety of agreement and so of greater relationship and of highest thinking. When the mind is creatively empty—not when it is positively directing—there is reality. All great discoveries are born in this creative emptiness and there can only be creative emptiness when self-contradiction ceases. As long as craving exists there will be self-contradiction. Therefore instead of approaching life positively, as most of us do, giving rise to the many miseries, brutalities, conflicts of which we know so well, why not approach it negatively which is not really negation?

When I use the terms positive and negative I am not using them in opposition to each other. When we begin to understand what we call the positive, which is the outcome of ignorance, then we shall find that from this there comes a surety in negation. In trying to understand the ever contradictory nature of the self, of the me and the mine, with its positive craving and denial, pursuit and death, there comes into being the still, creative emptiness. It is not the result of positive or negative action but a state of non-duality. When the mind-heart is still, creatively empty, then only is there reality.

Questioner: You said a man who meets anger with anger becomes anger. Do you mean that when we fight cruelty with the weapons of cruelty we too become the enemy; yet if we do not protect ourselves the bandit kills us.

Krishnamurti: Surely that thing which you fight you become. (Must we explain this too? All right.) If I am angry and you meet me with anger what is the result—more anger. You have become that which I am. If I am evil and you fight me with evil means then you also become evil, however righteous you may feel. If I am brutal and you use brutal methods to overcome me, then you become brutal like me. And this we have done thousands of years. Surely there is a different approach than to meet hate by hate? If I use violent methods to quell anger in myself then I am using wrong means for a right end and thereby the right end ceases to be. In this there is no understanding; there is no transcending

anger. Anger is to be studied tolerantly and understood; it is not to be overcome through violent means. Anger may be the result of many causes and without comprehending them there is no escape from anger.

We have created the enemy, the bandit, and through becoming ourselves the enemy in no way brings about an end to enmity. We have to understand the cause of enmity and cease to feed it by our thought, feeling and action. This is an arduous task demanding constant self-awareness and intelligent pliability, for what we are the society, the State is. The enemy and the friend are the outcome of our thought and action. We are responsible for creating enmity and so it is more important to be aware of our own thought and action than to be concerned with the foe and the friend, for right thinking puts an end to division. Love transcends the friend and the enemy.

May 21, 1944

III

In my first talk I tried to explain that right thinking can come only with self-knowledge. Without right thinking you cannot know what is true. Without knowing yourself, your relationship, your action, your every day existence has no true basis. Our existence is a state of opposition and contradiction, and any thought and action that spring from them can never be true. And before we can understand the world, our conduct and relationship with another, we must know ourselves. When the individual puts himself in opposition to the mass he is acting in ignorance, in fear, for he is the result of the mass, he is the result of the past. We cannot separate ourselves or put ourselves in opposition to anything if we wish to understand it.

In the second talk we somewhat touched upon thought putting itself in opposition, thereby creating duality. We should understand this before we begin to be concerned with our every day thought and activity. If we do not understand what it is that brings about this dualism, this instinctive opposition as yours and mine, we shall not understand the meaning of our conflict. We are aware, in our life, of dualism and its constant conflict; wanting and not wanting, heaven and hell, the State and the citizen, light and darkness. Does not dualism arise from craving? In the will to become, to be, is there not also the will of not-

becoming? In positive craving there is also negation and so thought-feeling is caught up in the conflict of opposites. Through the opposites there is no escape from conflict, from sorrow.

The desire to become, without understanding duality, is a vain struggle; the conflict of the opposites ceases if we can grapple with the problem of craving. Craving is the root of all ignorance and sorrow and there is no freedom from ignorance and sorrow save in the abandonment of craving. It is not to be set aside through mere will for will is part of craving; it is not to be set aside through denial for such denial is the outcome of opposites. Craving can be dissolved only through becoming aware of its many ways and expressions; through tolerant observation and understanding it is transcended. In the flame of understanding craving is consumed.

Let us examine the desire to become virtuous. Is there virtue when there is consciousness of vice? Do you become virtuous by putting yourself in opposition to vice or is virtue a state which is not anchored in the opposites? Virtue comes into being when there is freedom from opposites. Is generosity, kindness, love, opposite to greed, envy, hate or is love something that is beyond and above all contradictions? By putting ourselves in opposition to violence, will there be peace? Or is peace something that is beyond, transcending both the opposites? Is not true virtue a negation of becoming? Virtue is the freedom from craving.

We must become aware of this complex problem of duality through constant watchfulness, not to correct but to understand; for if we do not understand how to cultivate right thinking, from which comes right endeavor, then we shall be continually developing opposites with their endless conflicts.

Does right thinking come through the conflict of opposites or does it come into being when the cause of opposites, craving, is thought out, felt out and so understood? Freedom from the opposites is only possible when thought-feeling is able to observe without acceptance, denial or comparison its actions and responses; out of this awareness comes a new feeling, a new understanding which is not anchored in the opposites. Thought-feeling that is caught in duality is not capable of understanding the timeless. So, from the very beginning of our thinking we must lay the right foundation for true endeavor, for right means lead to right ends and wrong means will produce wrong ends. Wrong means will not at any time take us to right ends, only in right means lie right ends.

Questioner: I find it extremely difficult to understand myself. How am I to begin?

Krishnamurti: Is it not very important that one must understand oneself above everything else? For if we do not understand ourselves

The mind has to slow itself down and how is this to be done? If it forces itself to be slow then opposition is brought into being which creates further conflict, further complication. Compulsion of any kind will nullify its effort. To be aware of each thought-feeling is extremely arduous and difficult; to recognize that which is trivial and to let go, to be aware of that which is significant and to follow it, penetratingly and deeply, is strenuous, requiring extensional concentration.

I would like to suggest a way but don't make of it into a hard and fast system, a tyrannical technique or the only way, a boring routine or duty. We know how to keep a diary, writing down all the events of the day in the evening. I do not suggest that we should keep a retrospective diary but try to write down *every* thought-feeling, whenever you have a little time. If you try it, you will see how extremely difficult even this is. When you do write you can only put down one or two thoughts because your thinking is too rapid, disconnected and wandering. And as you cannot write down everything, because you have other things to do, you will find after a while that another layer of your consciousness is taking note. When again you have leisure to write, all those thoughts-feelings to which you have not given conscious attention will be "remembered." So at the end of the day you will have written down as much of your thoughts and feelings as possible. Of course only those who are earnest will do this. At the end of the day look at what you have written down during the day. This study is an art, for out of it comes understanding. What is important is how you study what you have written, rather than the mere writing down.

If you put yourself in opposition to what you have written you will not understand it. That is, if you accept or deny, judge or compare, you will not grasp the significance of all that is written, for identification prevents the flowering of thought-feeling. But if you examine it, suspending judgment, it will reveal its inward contents. To examine with choiceless awareness, without fear or favor, is extremely difficult. Thus you learn to slow down your thoughts and feelings but also, which is enormously important, to observe with tolerant dispassion every thought-feeling, free from judgment and perverted criticism. Out of this comes deep understanding which is cultivated not only during the waking hours but during sleep. From this you will find there comes candor, honesty.

But then you will be able to follow each movement of thought-feeling. For in this is involved not only the comprehension of the superficial layer but also of the many hidden layers of consciousness. Thus through constant self-awareness there is deeper and wider self-knowledge. It is a book of many volumes; in its beginning is its ending. You cannot skip a paragraph, a page, in order to reach the end quickly and greedily. For wisdom is not bought by the coin of greed or impatience. It comes as the

is true if you have no knowledge of yourself? If you do not know yourself, you will not know reality. Psychology is not an end in itself. It is but a beginning. In the study of oneself, right foundation is laid for the structure of reality. You must have the foundation but it is not an end in itself, it is not the structure. If you have not laid the right foundation, ignorance, illusion, superstition will come into being, as they exist in the world today. You must lay the right foundation with right means. You cannot have the right with wrong means. The study of oneself is an extremely difficult task and without self-knowledge and right thinking, ultimate reality is not comprehensible. If you are not aware of and so do not understand the self-contradiction, the confusion and the different layers of consciousness, then on what are you to build? Without self-knowledge that which you build, your formulations, beliefs, hopes will have little significance.

To understand oneself requires a great deal of detachment and subtlety, perseverance and penetration; not dogmatism, not assertion, not denial, not comparison which lead to dualism and confusion. You must be your own psychologist, you must be aware of yourself, for out of yourself is all knowledge and wisdom. Nobody can be an expert about you. You have to discover for yourself and so liberate yourself; not another can help you in freeing yourself from ignorance and sorrow. You create your own sorrow and there is no savior but yourself.

Questioner: Do I understand you to say that through the constant practice of instantaneously discerning the cause of every thought that enters the mind, the true self will begin to be revealed?

Krishnamurti: If we assume that there is a true and a false self then we shall not understand what is true. Don't you see it is like this: we are out on a voyage of discovery. To discover, thought-feeling must not be clogged by any hypothesis or belief; they hinder. To discover there must be freedom, there must be alert passivity. The knowledge of others is of little value in the discovery of truth. It must be found by yourself, not another can give it to you, not another can bring you wisdom. Truth is not a reward, it is not the result of a practice, nor is it to be assumed nor formulated. If you formulate it you will miss it, your hypothesis will only cloud it. Through constant awareness you will discover what is true of the self. It is this discovery that matters for it will liberate thought from ignorance and sorrow; what you discover on this journey, that will liberate, not your assertions and denials of the true and the false. To discover how one's thought-feeling is entrenched in creed, in belief, to discover the significance of the conflict of the opposites, to become aware of lust, of worldliness, of craving for self-continuity, is to be liberated from ignorance and sorrow. Through self-

awareness comes self-knowledge and right thinking. There is no right thinking without self-knowledge.

Questioner: Do you mean that right thinking is a continual process of awareness while right thought is merely static? Why is right thought not right thinking?

Krishnamurti: Right thinking is a continual process born of self-discovery, of self-awareness. There is no beginning and no end to this process so right thinking is eternal. Right thinking is timeless; it is not bound by the past, by memory, not limited by formulation. It is born of freedom from fear and hope. Without the living quality of self-knowledge, right thinking is not possible. Right thinking is creative for it is a constant process of self-discovery. Right thought is thought conditioned; it is a result, is made up, is put together; it is the outcome of a pattern, of memory, of habit, of practice. It is imitative, accumulative, traditional. It shapes itself through fear and hope, through greed and becoming, through authority and copy. Right thinking-feeling goes above and beyond the opposites, whereas right or conditioned thought is oppressed by the opposites. The conflict of the opposites is static.

Right thinking is the outcome of how to think, not what to think. But most of us have been trained or are training ourselves what to think, which is to think in terms of conditioning. Our civilization is based on what to think which is given to us through organized religions, through political parties and their ideologies and so on. Propaganda is not conducive to right thinking; it tells you what to think.

Through self-awareness the pattern, the copy, the habit, the conditioned thought is discovered; this perception begins to free thought-feeling from bondage, from ignorance; through constant awareness and self-knowledge, which bring about right thinking, there is that creative stillness of reality. The craving for security brings about conditioned thought; to seek certainty is to find it but it is not the real. Highest wisdom comes with that creative stillness of the mind-heart.

May 28, 1944

In the last three talks I have been trying to explain that right thinking, which comes from self-knowledge, is not to be acquired through another, however great, nor through any book; but rather through the experience of self-discovery, through that discovery which is creative and liberating. I tried to explain that as our life is a series of struggles and conflicts, unless we understand right endeavor we will be creating not clarity and peace but more conflict and more pain; that without self-knowledge, to make a choice between the opposites must inevitably lead to further ignorance and sorrow.

I do not know how clearly I explained this problem of conflict between the opposites; for till we deeply understand its cause and effect our endeavor, however earnest and strenuous, will not liberate us from our confusion and misery. However much we may formulate or try to understand that which we call God or Truth, we cannot comprehend the unknown until the mind itself becomes as vast, as immeasurable as the thing it is trying to feel, to experience. To experience the immeasurable, the unknowable, mind must go beyond and above itself.

Thought-feeling is limited through its own cause, the craving to become, which is time binding. Craving, through identifying memory, creates the self, the me and the mine. It is the actor taking different rôles to suit different occasions but inwardly ever the same. Till this craving, the cause of our ignorance and sorrow, is understood and dissolved, the conflict of duality will continue and effort to disentangle from it will only plunge us more into it. *This craving expresses itself through sensuality, through worldliness, through personal immortality, through authority, mystery, miracle.* Just as long as the mind is the instrument of the self, of craving, so long will there be duality and conflict. Such a mind cannot comprehend the immeasurable.

The self, the consciousness of the me and the mine, is built up through craving, by a series of thoughts and feelings not only in the past but by the influence of that past in the present. We are the result of the past; our being is founded in it. The many interrelated layers of our consciousness are the outcome of the past. This past is to be studied and understood through the living present; through the data of the present the past is uncovered. In studying the self and its cause, craving, we shall begin to understand the way of ignorance and sorrow. To merely deny craving, to merely oppose its many expressions is not to transcend it but to continue in it. To deny worldliness is still to be worldly; but if you understand the ways of craving then the tyranny of the opposites, pos-

session and non-possession, merit and demerit, ceases. If we deeply inquire into craving, meditating upon it, becoming aware of its deeper and wider significance and so begin to transcend it, we shall awaken to a new, different faculty which is not begotten of craving nor of the conflict of the opposites. Through constant self-awareness there comes unidentifying observation, the study of the self without judgment. Through this awareness the many layers of self-consciousness are discovered and understood. Self-knowledge brings right thinking which alone will free thought-feeling from craving and its many conflicting sorrows.

Questioner: Does the understanding of oneself lead to a change of the problem and idea? One can understand how nationalism comes into being: education, persecution, vanity et cetera, but the nationalist remains still a nationalist. The will to change, to understand the problem, does not bring the real dissipation of that problem. So what is the next step after knowing the causes in this thought process?

Krishnamurti: To identify oneself with a particular race, with a particular country or with certain ideologies yields security, satisfaction and flattering self-importance. This worship of the part, instead of the whole, cultivates antagonism, conflict and confusion. If you think this out, feel this out clearly and intelligently, not examining the mere ideas but your response to them, in comprehending the full implication of nationalism, order and clarity will come into that thin layer of consciousness with which we function every day. It is important to do this; to become conscious of the full significance of nationalism, how it divides humanity which is one; how it breeds antagonism and oppression; how it encourages the ownership of property and of family; how it conditions thought-feeling through organizations; how it cultivates economic barriers and poverty, wars, miseries and so on.

In deeply understanding the implication of nationalism, order and clarity are brought into the conscious mind and into this clarity the hidden, the stored up responses project themselves. Through studying these projections, diligently and intelligently, the whole consciousness is freed from the disease of nationalism. Then you do not become an internationalist, which still maintains separatism and the worship of the part; but there is an awareness of unity and non-nationality, a freedom from labels and names, from racial and class prejudice.

The same process can be applied to all our problems; to think-feel over the problem as widely and freely as possible, thus bringing order and clarity to the conscious mind which then can respond with understanding to the projections of the hidden, inner impulses and injunctions; thus wholly resolving the problem. Till the many layers of

memory are searched out, exposed and their responses fully understood, the problem will continue; but this search, this inquiry, is not possible if the conscious mind has not cleared itself of the problem. Not to be completely identified with the problem is our difficulty for identification prevents the flow of thought-feeling; identification implies acceptance or denial, judgment or comparison, which distort our understanding. Thought-feeling, to free itself from any problem, from any hindrance, is not the work of a moment. Freedom demands outer and inner awareness, the outer ready to receive the inner responses; this constant awareness brings deeper and wider self-knowledge. In self-knowledge there is the freedom of right thinking and only in self-knowledge are problems, bondages, understood and dissolved.

Questioner: I am a very active person physically. A time is coming when I shall not be. How shall I then occupy my time?

Krishnamurti: Most of us are caught up in sensate values, and the world around us is organized to increase and maintain them. We become more and more involved in them and unthinkingly grow old, worn out by outward activity but inwardly inactive and poor. Soon the outward, noisy activity comes to an inevitable end and then we become aware of loneliness, poverty of being. In order not to face this pain and fear, some continue ceaselessly to be active socially, in organized religion, politically and in the business world, giving justifications for their activity and noisy bustle. For those who cannot continue outward activity the question of what to do in old age arises. They cannot become suddenly inwardly active, they do not know what it means, their whole life has been against it. How are they to become inwardly aware?

It would be wise if after a certain age, perhaps let us say forty or forty-five, or younger still, you retired from the world, before you are too old. What would happen if you did retire not merely to enjoy the fruit of sensate gatherings but retired in order to find yourself, in order to think-feel profoundly, to meditate, to discover reality? Perhaps you may save mankind from the sensate, worldly path it is following, with all its brutality, deception and sorrow. Thus there may be a group of people, being disassociated from worldliness, from its identifications and demands, able to guide it, to teach it. Being free from worldliness they will have no authority, no importance and so will not be drawn into its stupidities and calamities. For a man who is not free from authority, from position, is not able to guide, to teach another. A man who is in authority is identified with his position, with his importance, with his work and so is in bondage. To understand the freedom of truth there must be freedom to experience. If such a group came into being then they could produce a new world, a new culture.

It is sad for him who, with old age approaching, begins to question his empty life; at least he has begun to wake up . . . A couple came to see me the other day. They were working in a factory earning large sums. They were old. In the course of conversation a suggestion naturally arose that they withdraw, considering their age, to think, to live anew. They looked surprised and said: "What about?"

You may laugh but I am afraid most of us are in the same position. For most of us thinking, searching, is along a clear cut groove of a particular dogma or belief, and to follow that groove is considered religious, intelligent. Right thinking begins only with self-knowledge and not in the knowledge of ideas and facts which is only an extension of ignorance. But if you, whether you are old or young, begin to understand yourself, you will discover great and imperishable treasures. But to discover, demands persistent awareness, adjustment and application; awareness of *every* thought-feeling and out of this the treasure of life is discovered.

Questioner: How can we truly understand ourselves, our infinite riches, without developing a whole complete perception first; otherwise with our comparative perception of thought, we get only a partial understanding of that infinite flow of cause in whose order we move and have our true conscious being.

Krishnamurti: How can you understand the whole when you are worshipping the part! Being petty, partial, limited, how can you understand that which is boundless, infinite? The small cannot grasp the great but the small can cease to be. In understanding what makes for limitation, for partiality, and transcending it, you will then be able to comprehend the whole, the limitless. From the known the unknown is realized but to speculate about the unknowable is merely to deny the limited, the trivial; and so all speculation becomes a hindrance for the understanding of reality.

Begin to understand yourself and in that there will be discovered immeasurable riches. Begin with the known, with the trivial, the limited, the confused; the small that is bound by fear, by belief, by lust, by ill will. It is petty, partial because it is the product of ignorance. How can such a mind understand the whole? It cannot. If thought-feeling frees itself from craving, and so from ignorance and sorrow, then only is there a possibility of understanding the whole. How can there be understanding of the causeless when our thought-feeling is a result, when it is bound to time? This seems so obvious that it does not require much explanation, but yet so many are caught up in the illusion that we must first have the vision, the perception of the whole, a working hypothesis of it as a beginning, before there is understanding of the part. To have

a perception of that completeness, the realization of that infinite reality, the singularistic, the limited mind must break down the barriers that confine it. From a small, narrow opening the wide heavens are not to be perceived. We try to perceive the whole through the small aperture of our thought-feeling and what we see must inevitably be small, partial, incomplete. We say we want to understand the whole, yet we cling to the petty, to the me and the mine. Through self-awareness, which brings self-knowledge, right thinking is nurtured, which alone will free us from our triviality and sorrow. When the mind ceases to chatter, when it is not playing any part, when it is not grasping or becoming, when it is utterly still, in that creative emptiness is the whole, the uncreated.

Questioner: Do you believe there is evil in the world?

Krishnamurti: Why do you ask me that question? Are you not aware of it? Are not its actions obvious, its sorrow crushing? Who has created it but each one of us? Who is responsible for it but each one of us? As we have created good, however little, so we have created evil, however vast. Good and evil are part of us and are also independent of us. When we think-feel narrowly, enviously, with greed and hate, we are adding to the evil which turns and rends us. This problem of good and evil, this conflicting problem, is always with us as we are creating it. It has become part of us, this wanting and not wanting, loving and hating, craving and renouncing. We are continually creating this duality in which thought-feeling is caught up. Thought-feeling can go beyond and above good and its opposite, only when it understands its cause—craving. In understanding merit and demerit there is freedom from both. Opposites cannot be fused and they are to be transcended through the dissolution of craving. Each opposite must be thought out, felt out, as extensively and deeply as possible, through all the layers of consciousness; through this thinking out, feeling out, a new comprehension is awakened which is not the product of craving, or of time.

There is evil in the world to which we are contributing as we contribute to the good. Man seems to unite more in hate, than in good. A wise man realizes the cause of evil and good, and through understanding frees thought-feeling from it.

Questioner: Last Sunday I understood from what you said that we do not take time from our jobs, family, activities, to study ourselves. This seems a contradiction of your former statement that one can be aware in everything one does.

Krishnamurti: Surely you begin by being aware in everything that you do. But what happens when you are so aware? If you pursue this awareness more and more you come to be alone but not isolated.

No object is ever in isolation; to be is to be related whether alone or with many. But when you begin to be aware in everything you do, you are beginning to study yourself, you are beginning to be more and more aware of your inward private thoughts-feelings, motives, fears and so on. The more there is self-awareness the more self-recollected you become; you become more silent, more purely aware. We are too much occupied with family, job, friends, social affairs and we are little aware; old age and death creep upon us and our life is empty. If you are aware in your daily relationship and activity, you will begin to disentangle thought-feeling from the cause of ignorance and sorrow. Through becoming aware of the inward as well as the superficial actions and responses, distractions will naturally cease and a simple life will inevitably follow.

Questioner: Do you think you will ever come back to the Masters?

Krishnamurti: The questioner believing and hoping in the Masters wishes to bring me back to his fold; perhaps he thinks that having once accepted his belief I will return to it.

Let us examine this belief in the Masters intelligently, without identifying ourselves with it. For some it will be difficult as they are greatly taken up with it but let us try to think-feel as openly and freely as possible concerning it. Why do you need Masters? Those supposed living beings with whom you are not directly in contact? You will say probably that they act as sign posts to reality. If they are sign posts why do you stop and worship them? Why do you accept the sign posts, the mediators, the messengers, the in-between authorities? Then why do you form organizations, groups round about them? If you are seeking truth why all this bother about them, why the exclusive organizations and secret conclaves? Is it not because it is easier and pleasanter to linger, to worship at a wayside shrine, taking comfort in it, rather than to go on the long journey of search and discovery? No one can lead you to truth, neither the Masters nor the gods nor their messengers. You alone have to toil, search out and discover.

A teacher with whom you are directly in contact is one thing, though it has its own dangers; but to be supposedly in contact with those whom you are not directly in touch with, or in touch with through their supposed representatives or messengers, is to invite superstition, oppression and other grave hindrances. The worship of authority is the very denial of truth. Authority blinds and the flowering of intelligence is destroyed; arrogance and stupidity increase, intolerance and division grow and multiply.

Fundamentally what can the Masters tell you? To know yourself, to cease to hate, to be compassionate, to seek reality. Any other teaching would be of little importance. None can give you a technique, a set

formula to know yourself. If you had one and you followed it, you would not know yourself; you would know the result of a formula but *not yourself*. To know, you will have to search and discover within yourself. The result of a technique, of a practice, of a habit is uncreative, mechanical. Not another can help you to understand yourself and without understanding yourself there is no comprehension of reality. This search for the Masters is the prompting of worldliness. A super sensitive value is still of this world and so the cause of ignorance and sorrow.

Then one might ask what are you doing, are you not a sign post? If I am and you gather round it to put flowers, to build a shrine and all the stupidities that go with it, then it is utterly foolish and unworthy of grown up people. What we are trying to do is to learn how to cultivate right thinking—which comes only through self-knowledge. On the foundation of right thinking is the Highest. This knowledge none can give you, but you yourself have to become aware of all your thoughts-feelings. For in yourself is the beginning and the end, the whole of life. The Highest is to be discovered, not formulated.

To read the pages of the past, you must know yourself as in the present for through the present the past is revealed. With you is the key that opens the door to reality; none can offer it for it is yours. Through your own awareness you can open the door; through your own self-awareness only can you read the rich volume of self-knowledge, for in it are the hints and the openings, the hindrances and the blockages that prevent and yet lead to the Timeless, to the Eternal.

June 4, 1944

V

Till we understand the problems involved in craving, as I was explaining last Sunday, the conflict and sorrow of our daily life cannot be dissolved. There are three principal forms craving takes: sensuality, worldliness and personal immortality; the gratification of the senses, the desire for prosperity, personal power and fame. In analyzing the craving for the gratification of the senses we realize its insatiability, its torments, its ever increasing demands; its end is misery and conflict. When we examine worldliness it too reveals incessant strife, confusion and sorrow. The craving for personal immortality is born of illusion for the self is a

A mind that is uncertain, self-contradictory, cannot know what is candor, honesty. Honesty demands humility and there can be humility only when you are aware of your own state of self-contradiction, of your own uncertainty. Self-contradiction and uncertainty will ever exist if there is craving, uncertainty of value, of action, of relationship. He who is certain is obstinate, thoughtless. He who knows does not know. In becoming aware of this uncertainty surely you are cultivating detachment, dispassion. The beginning of humility is detachment. And surely this is the first step of the ladder. This step of the ladder must be worn away for you have trod on it so often. A man who is conscious of detachment ceases to be detached; but he who has concerned himself with craving and its ways is becoming virtuous without striving after virtue; he is dispassionate without seeking it. Without candid awareness, understanding and peace are not possible.

Questioner: Besides wasting so much paper, do you seriously intend that we should put down every thought and feeling?

Krishnamurti: I suggested the other day that in order to understand ourselves we must become aware and to study ourselves thought-feeling must slow itself down. If you become aware of your own thinking-feeling, you will perceive how rapid it is, one disconnected thought-feeling following another, wandering and distracted; and it is impossible to observe, examine such confusion. To bring order and so clarity, I suggested that every thought-feeling be written down. This whirling machinery must slow itself down to be observed, so writing every thought-feeling may be of help. As in a slow motion picture you are able to see every movement, so in slowing down the rapidity of the mind you are then able to observe every thought, trivial and important. The trivial leads to the important and do not brush it aside as being petty. Since it is there it is an indication of the pettiness of the mind and to brush it aside does not make the mind any the less trivial, stupid. To brush it aside helps to keep the mind small, narrow, but to be aware of it, to understand it leads to great riches.

If any of you have tried to write as I suggested a couple of weeks ago, you will know. It is difficult it is to put down every thought and feeling. You will not only use a lot of paper but you will not be able to write down all your ~~about~~ feelings for your mind is too rapid in its distractions. But if you have the intention of putting down every thought-feeling, however trivial and stupid, the shameful and the pleasant, however little you may succeed at first you will soon discover a peculiar thing happening. As you have not the time to write every thought-feeling, for you have to give your attention to other matters, you will find that one of the layers of consciousness is recording every

thought-feeling. Though you do not give your attention directly to write down nevertheless you are inwardly aware and when you have time to write again, you will find that the recordings of inward awareness will come to the surface. If you will look over what you have written you will find yourself either condemning or approving, justifying or comparing. This approbation or denial prevents the flowering of thought-feeling and so stops understanding. If you do not condemn, justify or compare but ponder over, try to understand, then you will discover that these thoughts-feelings are indications of something much deeper. So you are beginning to develop that mirror which reflects your thoughts-feelings without any distortion. And by observing them you are comprehending your actions and responses and so self-knowledge becomes wider and deeper. You not only comprehend the present momentary action and reaction but also the past that has produced the present. And for this you must have quiet and solitude. But society does not allow you to have them. You must be with people, outwardly active at all costs. If you are alone you are considered anti-social or peculiar, or you are afraid of your own loneliness. But in this process of self-awareness you will discover many things about yourself and so of the world.

Do not treat this writing down as a new method, a new technique. Try it. But what is important is to become aware of every thought-feeling, from which arises self-knowledge. You must start out on the journey of self-discovery; what you find does not depend on any technique—technique prevents discovery—and it is the discovery that is liberating and creative. What is important is not your determination, conclusion, choice, but what you discover, for that will bring understanding.

If you do not wish to write down then become aware of every thought-feeling, which is much more difficult. Become aware, for example, of your resentment if you have any. To be aware of it is to be aware of what caused it, why and how it has been stored up, how it is shaping your actions and responses and how it is your constant companion. Surely to be aware of resentment, antagonism, involves all this and more, and it is very difficult to be aware of it so completely, comprehensively as in a flash; but if you are, you will find that it transforms itself. If you cannot be so aware, put down your thoughts-feelings, learn to study them with tolerant dispassion and little by little the whole content of your thoughts-feelings is discovered. It is this discovery, this understanding, that is the liberating and transforming factor.

Questioner: Did you seriously mean what you said when you suggested last week that one should retire from the world when one is around forty-five or so?

Krishnamurti: Periodically one group exploits another group and the exploitation brings on a violent crisis. This has been happening throughout the ages, one race dominating, exploiting, murdering another race and in turn oppressed, cheated, poverty stricken. How is this to be solved? Is it to be adjusted only through outward legislation, outward organization, outward education, or by understanding the inner conflicting causes that have produced the outer chaos and misery? You cannot grasp the inner without understanding the outer. If you merely try to put down one race exploiting or oppressing another, then you will become the exploiter, the oppressor. If you adopt evil methods for a righteous end, the end is transformed by the means. So until we grasp this deeply, lastingly, mere reformation of evil by evil methods is productive of further evil; thus reform ever needs further reform. We think we see its obviousness and yet we allow ourselves to be persuaded to the contrary, through fear, propaganda and so on, which means really that we do not grasp its truth.

As the individual, so the nation, so the State; you may not be able to transform another but you can be certain of your own transformation. You may stop one country exploiting another by violent methods, by economic sanctions and so on but what guarantee is there that the very nation that is putting an end to the ruthlessness of another is not going to be also oppressive, ruthless? There is no guarantee, no guarantee whatsoever. On the contrary, in fighting evil by evil means, the nation, the individual becomes that which he is fighting. You may build an outer, superficial structure of excellent legislation to control, to check, but if there is no good will and brotherly love, the inward conflict and poverty explode and produce chaos. Mere legislation does not prevent the West from exploiting the East or perhaps the East from exploiting the West in its turn, but just as long as we, individually or in groups, identify ourselves with this or that race, nation or religion, so long will there be wars and exploitation, oppression and starvation. Just as long as you admit to yourself division, the long list of absurd divisions as an American, Englishman, German, Hindu and so on, just as long as you are not aware of human unity and relationship, so long will there be *mass murder and sorrow*. A people that is guided, checked by mere legislation is as an artificial flower, beautiful to look upon but empty within.

You will probably say that the world will not wait for individual awakening or for the awakening of a few to alter its course. Yes, it will go on in its blind, set course. But it will awaken through each individual who can throw off his bondage to division, to worldliness, to personal ambition and power; through his understanding, through his compas-

eradicate them which is a difficult task; since you will not face that task you try to legalize war; you have covenants, leagues, international security and so on, but greed, ambition over-rule them and war and catastrophe inevitably follow.

To help another, you must know yourself; like you, he is the result of the past. We are all interrelated. If you are inwardly diseased by ignorance, ill will and passion, you will inevitably spread disease and darkness. If you are inwardly healthy and integrated, you spread light and peace; otherwise you help to produce greater chaos, greater misery. To understand oneself requires patience, tolerant awareness; the self is a book of many volumes which you cannot read in a day, but when once you begin to read, you must read every word, every sentence, every paragraph for in them are the intimations of the whole. The beginning of it is the ending of it. If you know how to read, supreme wisdom is to be found.

Questioner: Is awareness only possible during waking hours?

Krishnamurti: The more you are conscious of your thoughts-emotions, the more you are aware of your whole being. Then the sleeping hours become an intensification of the waking hours. Consciousness functions even in so-called sleep, of which we are well aware. You think over a problem pretty thoroughly and yet you cannot solve it; you sleep over it, which phrase we often use. In the morning we find its issues are clearer and we seem to know what to do; or we perceive a new aspect of it which helps to clear up the problem. How does this happen? We can attribute a lot of mystery and nonsense to it, but what does take place? In that so-called sleep the conscious mind, that thin layer is quiet, perhaps receptive; it has worried over the problem and now being weary is still, the tension removed. Then the promptings of the deeper layers of consciousness are discernible and when you wake up, the problem seems to have become clearer and easier to solve. So the more you are aware of your thoughts-feelings during the day, not for a few seconds or during a set period, the mind becomes quieter, alertly passive and so capable of responding and comprehending the deeper intimations. But it is difficult to be so aware; the conscious mind is not used to such intensity. The more aware the conscious mind is the more the inner mind cooperates with it and so there is deeper and wider understanding.

The more you are aware during the waking hours, the less dreams there are. Dreams are indications of thoughts-feelings, actions not completed, not understood, that need fresh interpretation, or frustrated thought-hope that needs to be fully comprehended. Some dreams are of no importance. Those that have significance have to be interpreted

eradicating, mystery and miracle. The craving for these is the beginning of sorrow and in yielding to them there is no end to sorrow. Freeing thought-feeling from craving is the beginning of virtue. Virtue is a negation of the self rather than the positive becoming of the self, for negative understanding is the highest form of thinking-feeling. The so-called positive becoming or the qualities of the self are self-enclosing, self-binding and so there is never freedom from conflict and sorrow. The desire to become, however noble and virtuous, is still within the narrow sphere of the self and so such a desire is the means of producing conflict and confusion. This process of constant becoming, supposedly positive, brings death with its fears and hopes. Freeing thought from craving, though it may appear as negation, is the essence of virtue for it is not building up the process of the self, the me and the mine.

As I said in my previous talks, in freeing thought-feeling from craving, in becoming aware of its ways, we begin to perceive the significance of candor, love, fear, simple life and so on. It is not that one must become candid, honest, but in thinking-feeling about it, in becoming extensively aware of it, its deeper implications are perceived rather than the self becoming honest. Virtue is not a structure upon which the self can build for in it there is no becoming. The self can never become candid, open, clear for its very nature is dark, enclosing, confusing, contradicting.

To become aware of ignorance is the beginning of candor, of honesty. To be unaware of ignorance breeds obstinacy and credulity. Without being aware of ignorance, to try to become honest only leads to further confusion. Without self-knowledge mere sincerity is narrowness and gullibility. If one begins to be self-aware and observes what is candor, then confusion yields to clarity. It is the lack of clarity that leads to dishonesty, to pretension. To be aware of escapes, distortions, hindrances, brings order and clarity. Ignorance, which is the lack of self-knowledge, leads to confusion, to dishonesty. Without understanding the contradictory nature of the self, to be candid is to be hard and to produce more and more confusion. Through self-awareness and self-knowledge there is order, clarity and right thinking.

The highest form of thinking is negative comprehension. To think-feel positively, without understanding craving, is to raise values that are separative, disruptive and uncreative.

Now, love is sorrowful; we are aware that there is in love sorrow, bitterness, disillusionment; the pain of love is a torment; in it we know fear and resentment. There is no escape from love but yet in it there is torture. The foolish blame love, without understanding the cause of pain; without knowing its conflict there is no transcending anguish.

Without becoming aware of the source of conflict, craving, love brings pain. It is craving, not love, that creates dependence and all the sorrowful issues that arise out of it. It is craving in relationship that gives rise to uncertainty, not love; and this uncertainty breeds possessiveness, jealousy, fear. In this possessiveness, in this dependence, there is a false sense of unity which sustains and nourishes the temporary feeling of well being; but it is not love, for in it there is inward fear and suspicion. This outward stimulation of seeming oneness is parasitical, the living of the one on the other; it is not love for inwardly there is emptiness, loneliness and the need for dependence. Dependence breeds fear, not love. Without understanding craving is there not domination, oppression, taking the form of love? In relationship with the one or with the many such love of power and dominance, with its submissiveness and acceptance, brings conflict, antagonism and sorrow. Having the seed of violence within oneself how can there be love? Having the seed of contradiction and uncertainty within oneself how can there be love? Love is beyond and above all these; it transcends sensuousness. Love is in itself eternal not dependent, not a result. In it there is mercy and generosity, forgiveness and compassion. With love, humility and gentleness come into being; without love they have no existence.

Questioner: I am already an introvert and it seems to me that from what you have been saying, is there not a danger of my becoming more and more self-centered, more of an introvert?

Krishnamurti: If you are an introvert in opposition to an extrovert then there is a danger of self-centeredness. If you put yourself in opposition then there is no understanding; then your thoughts, feelings and actions are self-enclosing, isolating. In intelligently comprehending the outer you will come inevitably to the inner, and thereby the division of the outer and inner ceases. If you oppose the outer and cling to the inner or if you deny the inner and assert the outer, then there is the conflict of the opposites, in which there is no understanding. To understand the outer, the world, you must begin with yourself for you, your thoughts-feelings and actions, are the result of both the outer and the inner. You are the center of all objective and subjective existence and to comprehend it, where are you to begin save with yourself? This does not encourage unbalance, on the contrary it will bring creative understanding, inward peace.

But if you deny the outer, the world, if you try to escape from it, if you distort it, shaping it to your fancies, then your inner world is an illusion, isolating and hindering. Then it is a state of delusion which brings misery. To be is to be related but you can block, distort this relationship, thus becoming more and more isolated and self-centered

which leads to mental disorder. The root of understanding is within yourself, in self-knowledge.

Questioner: You, like so many Orientals, seem to be against industrialization. Why are you?

Krishnamurti: I do not know if many Orientals are against industrialization and if they are I do not know what reasons they would give, but I thought I explained why I consider that mere industrialization is not a solution for our human problem with its conflicts and sorrows. Mere industrialization encourages sensate value, bigger and better bathrooms, bigger and better cars, distractions, amusements and all the rest of it. External and temporal values take precedence over eternal value. Happiness, peace is sought in possessions, made by the hand or by the mind; in addiction to things or to mere knowledge. Walk down any principal street and you will see shop after shop selling the same thing in different colors, shapes; innumerable magazines and thousands of books. We want to be distracted, amused, taken away from ourselves for we are so wretched and poor, empty and sorrowful. And so where there is demand there is production and the tyranny of the machine. And we think by mere industrialization we shall solve the economic and social problem. Does it? You may temporarily, but with it come wars, revolutions, oppression, exploitation, bringing so-called civilization—industrialization with all its implications—to the uncivilized.

Industrialization and the machine are here, you cannot do away with them; they take their right place only when man is not dependent for his happiness on things, only when he cultivates inner riches, the imperishable treasures of reality. Without these mere industrialization brings untold horrors; with inner treasures industrialization has a meaning. This problem is not of any country or race; it is a human issue. Without the balancing power of compassion and unworldliness you will have, through the mere increase of the production of things, of facts and of technique, bigger and better wars, economic oppression and frontiers of power, more subtle ways of deception, disunity and tyranny.

A stone may change the course of a river, so a few who understand may perhaps divert this terrible course of man. But it is difficult to withstand the constant pressure of modern civilization unless one is constantly aware and so is discovering the treasures that are imperishable.

Questioner: Do you think that group meditation is helpful?

Krishnamurti: What is the purpose of meditation? Is not right thinking the foundation for the discovery of the Supreme? With right thinking the unknowable, the immeasurable comes into being. You must discover it, and to discover, your mind must be utterly uninfluenced.

sion can brutality and ~~immorality~~

Your mind must be completely silent, still, and creatively empty. The mind must free itself from the past, from conditioning influences, cease creating value.

You are the one and the many, the group and the single; you are the result of the past. There is no understanding of this whole process save through the result; you must study and examine the result which is yourself. To observe you must be detached, uninfluenced; cease to be a slave to propaganda, the subtle and the gross. The influence of environment shapes thought-feeling and from this too there must be freedom to discover the real which alone liberates. How easily we are persuaded to believe or not to believe, to act or not to act; magazines, newspapers, cinemas, radios, daily shape our thought-feeling and how few can escape from their limiting influence!

One religious group believes this and another that; their thoughts-feelings are imitative, influenced, fashioned. In this imitative confusion and assertion what hope is there of finding the real! To understand this mad confusion, thought-feeling must extricate itself from it and so become clear, unbiased and simple. To discover the real, mind-heart must free itself from the tyranny of the past; it must become purely alone. How easily the collective, the congregation is used, persuaded, and drugged! The discovery of the real is not to be organized; it must be sought out by each one, uncoerced, not urged by reward or punishment. When the mind ceases to create, there is creation.

Questioner: Is not belief in God necessary in this terrible and ruthless world?

Krishnamurti: We have had belief in God for centuries upon centuries but yet we have created a terrible world. The savage and the highly civilized priest believe in God. The primitive kills with bows and arrows and dances wildly, the civilized priest blesses the warships and the bombers and rationalizes. I am not saying this in any cynical, sneering spirit, so please do not smile. It is a grave matter. Both of them believe, and also there is the other who is non-believer but he also resorts to liquidating those who stand in his way. Clinging to a belief or to an ideology does not do away with killing, with oppression and exploitation. On the contrary, there have been and continue to be terrible, ruthless wars and destruction and persecution in the name of peace, in the name of God. If we can put aside these contending beliefs and ideologies and bring about a deep change in our daily life there will be a chance for a better world. It is our every day life that has brought this and previous catastrophes, horrors; our thoughtlessness, our exclusive national and economic privileges and barriers, our lack of

good will and compassion have brought these wars and other disasters. Worldliness will constantly erupt in chaos and in sorrow.

We are the result of the past and without understanding it, to build upon it is to invite disaster. The mind which is a result, which is put together, cannot hope to understand that which is not made up, that which is causeless, timeless. To comprehend the uncreated, the mind must cease to create. A belief is ever of the past, of the created, and such a belief becomes a hindrance to the experiencing of the real. When thought-feeling is anchored, made dependent, understanding of the real is not possible. There must be open, still freedom from the past, a spontaneous overflow of silence in which alone the real can flower. When you see a sunset, in that moment of beauty there is a spontaneous, creative joy. When you wish to repeat that experience again, there is no joy in the sunset; you try to receive that same creative happiness but it is not there. Your mind, not expecting, not wanting was capable of receiving, but having received it is greedy for more and it is this greed that blinds. Greed is accumulative and burdens the mind-heart; it is ever gathering, storing up. Thought-feeling is corrupted by greed, by the corroding waves of memory. Only through deep awareness is this engulfing process of the past brought to an end. Greed, like pleasure, is ever singularistic, limiting, and how can thought born of greed comprehend that which is immeasurable!

Instead of strengthening beliefs and ideologies become aware of your thoughts-feelings, for out of them spring the issues of life. What you are the world is; if you are cruel, lustful, ignorant, greedy, so is the world. Your belief or your disbelief in God is of little significance for by your thoughts-feelings-actions, you make the world terrible and ruthless, peaceful and compassionate, barbarous or wise.

Questioner: What is the source of desire?

Krishnamurti: Perception, contact, sensation, want and identification cause desire. The source of desire is sensation in its lowest and highest forms. And the more you demand to be satisfied sensually the more of worldliness which seeks continuity in the hereafter. Since existence is sensation we can but understand it, not become slaves to it, and so free thought to transcend into pure awareness. The desire to be satisfied must produce the means for satisfaction, at whatever cost. Such demand, such craving can be observed, studied, intelligently understood and transcended. To be enslaved to craving is to be ignorant and sorrow is its end.

Questioner: Don't you think that there is in man a principle of destruction, independent of his will to destroy and of his desire at the same time for life? Life in itself seems to be a process of destruction.

Krishnamurti: In all of us there is the dormant will to destroy like anger, ill will, which extended leads to world catastrophes; and also within us there is the desire to be thoughtful and compassionate. So there is at work within us this dual process, a seemingly endless conflict. The questioner wants to know if life itself does not seem to be a destructive process. Yes, it is, if we understand it to mean that in negation is the highest comprehension. This negation is the destruction of those values that are based on the positive, on the me and the mine. As long as life is self-becoming, enclosed by the thought-feeling of me and mine, it becomes a destructive process, cruel and uncreative. The positive, assertive becoming is ultimately death dealing, which is so obviously manifest in the world at the present time. Life pursued positively as the me and the mine is conflicting and destructive. When this positive, aggressive wanting or not wanting is put an end to, there is the awareness of fear, of death, of nothingness. But if thought can go above and beyond this fear then there is ultimate reality.

June 18, 1944

VII

I have been trying to explain in my last few talks how to cultivate right thinking; how right thinking comes with self-knowledge. The more you are aware of your thoughts-feelings the more you are detached, and the less you identify, the greater the self-knowledge; and it is this self-knowledge that dissolves ignorance and sorrow. In understanding the self, right thinking comes into being.

Virtue, as I explained, lies in freeing thought-feeling from craving; also to liberate thought there must be candor. Dependence destroys love. Craving must ever create attachment, possessiveness, from which arise jealousy, envy and those conflicts with which we are all too familiar. Where there is dependence and attachment, there love is not.

In understanding relationship we will find that the cause of disturbance and pain lies in depending on another for our inward sustenance and happiness. Relationship then becomes merely a means for self-gratification which breeds attachment and fear. Relationship is a process of self-revelation; relationship is as a mirror in which you begin to discover yourself, your tendencies, pretensions, selfish and limited

motives, fears and so on. In relationship, if you are aware, you will find that you are being exposed which causes conflict and pain. The thoughtful man welcomes this self-exposure to bring about order and clarity, to free his thought-feeling from isolating, self-enclosing tendencies. But most of us try to seek comfort and gratification in relationship; we do not desire to be revealed to ourselves, we do not wish to study ourselves as we are, so relationship becomes wearisome and we seek to escape. We seek peace in relationship and if we do not find it then we bring about gratifying changes till we find what we seek, dull comfort or some distraction to cover up our hollow emptiness and aching fears. But relationship will ever be painful, a constant struggle, till out of it comes deep and extensional self-knowledge. With deep self-knowledge there is inexhaustible love.

If we understand relationship and the cause of dependence we do not bring about enmity and this is of primary importance. The cause of enmity in all relationship is not to be discovered if relationship is not a self-revealing process. If there is no cause for enmity, then there is neither the friend nor the enemy, the forgiver nor the forgiven. We cause enmity through pride of position, knowledge, family, capacity and so awaken in another ill will and envy.

The craving to become causes fear; to be, to achieve, and so to depend engenders fear. The state of non-fear is not negation, it is not the opposite of fear nor is it courage. In understanding the cause of fear there is its cessation, not the becoming courageous, for in all becoming there is the seed of fear. Dependence on things, on people or on ideas breeds fear; dependence arises from ignorance, from the lack of self-knowledge, from inward poverty; fear causes uncertainty of mind-heart, preventing communication and understanding. Through self-awareness we begin to discover and so comprehend the cause of fear, not only the superficial but the deep causal and accumulative fears. Fear is both inborn and acquired; it is related to the past and to free thought-feeling from it the past must be comprehended through the present. The past is ever awaiting to give birth to the present which becomes the identifying memory of the me and the mine, the I. The self is the root of all fear.

To inhibit or suppress fear is not to transcend it; its cause must be self-discovered and so understood and dissolved. In becoming aware of craving and its dependence, in observing with kindly detachment its ways and actions, fear yields to understanding. There are, surely, three states of awareness of every problem: first to become aware of it; then to be deeply aware of its cause and effect and of its dual process; and to transcend it the thinker and his thought must be experienced as one. Most of us are unconscious, let us say, of fear and if we are conscious of it we become apprehensive, we run away from it, suppress or cover

it up. If we do none of these things then through constant awareness the cause and its processes begin to unfold themselves; if we are not impatient, if we are not greedy for a result, then this flame of awareness, which brings understanding, dissolves the cause and its ever developing processes. There is only one cause but its ways and expressions are many.

Inhibiting, prohibiting fear does not eradicate the cause of fear but only produces further factors of disturbance and suffering. Through tolerant observation of fear, through being aware of every happening of fear, it is allowed to unfold itself; by following it through, without identification, with kindly detachment, there comes creative understanding which alone dissolves the cause of fear, without developing its opposite which is another form of fear.

Questioner: Why don't you face the economic and social evils instead of escaping into some dark, mystical affair?

Krishnamurti: I have been trying to point out that only by giving importance to those things that are primary can the secondary issues be understood and solved. Economic and social evils are not to be adjusted without understanding what causes them. To understand them and so bring about a fundamental change, we have first to comprehend ourselves who are the cause of these evils. We have, individually and so as a group, created social and economic strife and confusion. We alone are responsible for them and thus we, individually and so perhaps collectively, can bring order and clarity. To act collectively we must begin individually; to act as a group each one must understand and change radically those causes within himself which produce the outer conflict and misery. Through legislation you may gain certain beneficial results, but without altering the inner, fundamental causes of conflict and antagonism they will be overturned and confusion will rise again; outer reforms will ever need further reform and this way leads to oppression and violence. Lasting outer order and creative peace can come about only if each one brings order and peace within himself.

Each one of us, whatever his position, is seeking power, is greedy, lustful or violent; without putting an end to these in himself, by himself, mere outward reform may produce superficial results, but these will be destroyed by those who are ever seeking position, fame and so on. To bring about the necessary and fundamental change in the outer world with its wars, competition and tyrannies, surely you must begin with yourself and deeply transform yourself. You will say no doubt that in this way it will take a very long time to reform the world. What of it? Will a short, drastic superficial revolution change the inward fact? Through the sacrifice of the present will a happy future be created? Through wrong means will the right ends come into being? We have not

been shown this and yet we pursue blindly, not thinking, with the result that there is utter destruction and misery. You can have peace, order, only through peaceful and orderly means. What is the purpose of outward economic and social revolutions: to liberate man, to help him think-feel fully, to live completely? But those who want immediate and quick change in the economic and social order, do they not also create the pattern of behavior and thought; not how to think but what to think? So it cheats its own purpose and man is again a plaything of the environment.

I have been trying to explain in these talks that ignorance, ill will and lust cause sorrow, and without self-purification of these hindrances we must inevitably produce outer conflict, confusion and misery. Ignorance, the lack of self-knowledge, is the greatest "evil." Ignorance prevents right thinking and gives primary emphasis to things that are secondary and so life is made empty, dull and a mechanical routine from which we seek various escapes: explosion into dogma, speculation and delusion and so on which is not mysticism. In trying to comprehend the outer world one comes to the inner and that inner, when properly pursued and rightly understood leads to the Supreme. This realization is not the fruit of escape. This realization alone will bring peace and order to the world.

The world is in a chaos because we have pursued wrong values. We have given importance to sensuality, to worldliness, to personal fame or immortality which produce conflict and sorrow. True value is found in right thinking; there is no right thinking without self-knowledge and self-knowledge comes with self-awareness.

Questioner: Don't you think there are peace-loving nations and aggressive nations?

Krishnamurti: No. The term, nation, is separative, exclusive and so the cause of contention and wars. There is no peace-loving nation; all are aggressive, dominant, tyrannical. As long as it remains a separate unit, apart from others, taking pride in segregation, in patriotism, in the race, it breeds untold misery for itself and for others. You may not have peace and yet be exclusive. You may not have economic and social, national and racial frontiers, without inviting enmity and jealousy, fear and suspicion. You may not have plenty while others starve, without inviting violence. We are not separate, we are human beings in common relationship. Your sorrow is the sorrow of another, by killing another you are destroying yourself, by hating another you suffer. For you are the other. Good will and brotherliness are not achieved through separate and exclusive nationalities and frontiers; they must be set aside to bring peace and hope for man.

And besides, why do you identify yourself with any nation, with any group or with any ideology? Is it not to protect your small self, to feed your petty and death dealing vanities, sustain your own glory? What pride is there in the self which brings wars and misery, conflict and confusion? A nation is the glorification of the self and so the breeder of strife and sorrow.

Questioner: I am greatly attracted and yet afraid of sex. It has become a torturing problem and how is one to solve it?

Krishnamurti: It has become a consuming problem because we have ceased to be creative. Intellectually and morally we have become merely imitative machines; religiously we merely copy, accept authority and are drugged. Our education narrows us; our society, being competitive, wastes us; the cinemas, radios, newspapers are continually telling us what to think, sensually and falsely stimulating us. We seek and are fed by incessant noise. So we find a release in sex which becomes a torturing problem.

Through self-awareness the repetitive habit of thought which we consider as thinking is brought into the light of understanding; by observing it, examining it with kindly detachment, suspending judgment, we shall begin to awaken creative understanding. This is the process of disengaging thought-feeling from all hindrances, limitations; when once we become aware of this process all our problems, trivial and complex, can be exposed to it and creative understanding extracted from it. So this is essential to grasp. Denial or acceptance, judgment or comparison, which mean identification, prevent the full flowering of thought-feeling. If you do not identify, then as thought-feeling flows, follow it through, think it out, feel it out as extensively and deeply as possible and so become aware of its wide and profound implications. Thus the narrow, small self-enclosed mind breaks through its self-imposed limitations and blockages. In this process of clarification there is inward, creative joy.

In this manner solve the problem of lust. And as I said, mere inhibition or suppression does not solve the problem but only acts as a further factor of excitation, disturbance, only strengthening the self-enclosing process of the me and the mine. Become aware of the problem as extensively and deeply as possible and thereby discover its cause. Do not identify with the cause by judging or comparing it, condemning or accepting it, but watch that cause expressing itself in many ways; follow it through, think it out, feel it out intelligently, with tolerant detachment. In this extensional awareness the problem is resolved and transcended.

There is a difference between conquering sensuality and the state of non-sensuality. In non-sensuality thought-feeling is no longer a slave to the senses and merely to conquer is to be conquered again. Awareness.

which brings creative understanding, frees thought-feeling from lust, but to find substitutions for lust is still to be lustful. There is no escape from conflict and sorrow save in right thinking. Without self-knowledge there is no right thinking. Through awareness the ways of the self are discovered and it is this discovery that liberates, that is creative. Love is chaste but a mind that plots to be is not.

Questioner: Don't you think that there is a principle of destruction in life, a blind will quite independent of man, always dormant, ready to spring into action, which can never be transcended?

Krishnamurti: Surely we know that within us there are these two opposing capacities: to destroy and to create, to be good and to be harmful. Now, are they independent of each other? Is the will to destroy separate from the will to live, or is the will to live, to become, in itself a process of destruction? What makes us destroy? What makes us angry, ignorant, brutal; what urges us to kill, to seek vengeance, to deceive? Is it a blind will, a thing over which we have no control whatever—let us call it the devil—an independent force of evil, or an uncontrollable ignorance? Is the urge to destroy inane or is it the response to a deeper demand to live, to be, to become? Is this reaction never to be transcended, or can it slow down to be examined and so understood? To slow down a response is possible. Or is there a blind spot which can never be examined, a result of heredity, an inborn result which has so conditioned our thinking that we are incapable of looking into it? And so we think that there is a power of destruction, of evil, which cannot be transcended.

Surely anything that has been created, that has been made up, can be understood by those who have created it. This dual process of good and evil is in us to create and to destroy. We have created it and so we can understand it; but to understand it we must have the faculty of dispassionate observation of ourselves which requires great alertness and pliable awareness. Or we can say that in all of us potentially there is a dormant evil, a power that is in itself destructive. Though we may be loving, generous, merciful, this power—like an earthquake—completely impersonal, seeks an occasional outburst. And as over an earthquake, over acts of nature we have no control, so over this power we have no influence whatever.

Now is this so? Can we not, in understanding ourselves, understand the causes that exist in us to destroy and to create? If first we can clear the confusion that exists in the superficial layer of our conscious mind, then into it because it is open, clear, the deeper layers of consciousness, with their contents, can project themselves. This clarification of the superficial layer comes when thought-feeling is not identifying but

detached and so capable of observing without comparison and judgment. Then only can it, the conscious mind, discover what is true. Thus you can test for yourself whether there is in you an element which is absolutely beyond your control, an element which is destructive. Then you can find out whether it is the result of conditioning, or whether it is ignorance or whether it is a blind spot or an independent, uncontrollable evil force. Only then can you discover whether or not you are capable of transcending it.

The more you comprehend yourself and so bring about right thinking the less you will find that there is any tendency, any ignorance, any force within you that cannot be transcended. And out of this you will discover an ecstasy that comes with understanding, with wisdom. It is not the faith and the hope of the foolish. In understanding ourselves completely and thus creating the faculty to delve deeply within, we will find there is nothing that cannot be examined or understood. Out of this self-knowledge comes creative understanding; but because we do not understand ourselves there is ignorance. What thought has created thought can transcend.

Questioner: Why are there so many insane, unbalanced people in the world?

Krishnamurti: What is this civilization that we have built up? A civilization which is the result of craving, the dominant factor of sensory gratification. And having produced a world in which sensate value dominates, naturally the creative sensibilities are either destroyed or warped or blocked. Through the value of the senses there is no release and so individuals resort to the fabrication of delusion, consciously or unconsciously, which eventually isolates them. Unless sensate value yields to eternal value we will have delusions and strife, confusion and war. To bring a fundamental change in value you must become thoughtful and discard those values of the self, of craving, through constant awareness and self-knowledge.

Questioner: I am intensely lonely. I cannot seem to go beyond this misery. What am I to do?

Krishnamurti: This is not an individual problem only; the whole human thought feels lonely. If we could think this out, feel this out deeply we would be able to transcend it. As I explained, we create through craving a dual process in ourselves, and thus there arises the I, the me, the self and the not-self, my work, my achievement and so on. Having created through craving this conflicting process of the I and not I, its natural outcome is isolation, utter loneliness. In relationship, in

action, if there is any self-enclosing thought-feeling it is bound to build up isolating walls which cause intense loneliness.

Craving engenders fear, fear nourishes dependence, dependence on things, people or ideas. The greater the dependence the greater the inward poverty. Becoming aware of this poverty, loneliness, you try to enrich it, try to fill it with knowledge or activity, with amusement or mystery. The more you try to fill it, to cover it up, the more deeply does the real cause of loneliness get buried. The self is insatiable and there is no satisfying it. It is as a broken vessel, a bottomless pit which can never be filled.

By becoming aware of thought-feeling creating its own bondage and dependence and thus bringing about isolation; by becoming aware of the cultivation of sensate values which must inevitably bring inward poverty; out of this very awareness, out of this extensional, meditative understanding there is discovered the imperishable treasure. Through this constant awareness, if rightly unfolded, ever deeper and wider, there comes into being the serenity and joy of highest wisdom.

June 25, 1944

I said that this morning we would try to understand what makes for simple life. Simple life is freedom from acquisitiveness, freedom from addiction and freedom from distraction. Freedom from acquisitiveness surely lies in understanding the cause that breeds in us the conflict of greed and envy. The more we acquire the greater the demand for possessions and to deny, to say, "I will not acquire" in no way solves the problem of greed and envy. But in watching it, in becoming aware of the process of acquisition and envy on all the different levels of our consciousness, we begin to understand their deeper significance, with all the economic, social and inward implications. This state of acquisitive conflict, competitive possessiveness is not conducive to simple life which is essential to understand the real. So if you become aware of acquisitiveness with its problems—not putting yourself in opposition to it and therefore developing the quality of non-acquisitiveness, which is only another form of greed—you will begin to be aware of its deeper and wider implications.

Then you will begin to understand that a mind caught up in greed and envy cannot experience the bliss of truth. A mind which is competitive, held in the conflict of becoming, thinking in terms of comparison, is not capable of discovering the real. Thought-feeling which is intensely aware is in the process of constant self-discovery which discovery, being true, is liberating and creative. Such self-discovery brings about freedom from acquisitiveness and from the complex life of the intellect. It is this complex life of the intellect that finds gratification in addictions: destructive curiosity, speculation, mere knowledge, capacity, gossip and so on; and these hindrances prevent simplicity of life. An addiction, a specialization gives sharpness to the mind, a means of focussing thought, but it is not the flowering of thought-feeling into reality.

The freedom from distraction is more difficult as we do not fully understand the process of thinking-feeling which in itself has become the means of distraction. Being ever incomplete, capable of speculative curiosity and formulation, it has the power to create its own hindrances, illusions, which prevent the awareness of the real. So it becomes its own distraction, its own enemy. As the mind is capable of creating illusion this power must be understood before it can be wholly free from its own self-created distractions. Mind must be utterly still, silent, for all thought becomes a distraction. Craving is the distorting factor and how can the mind that is capable of delusion know the simple, the real? Till craving in its multiple forms is understood and transcended, there is no joy of the inward, simple, full life. If you begin to be aware of the outward distractions and so trace them to the cause which is inner, then thought-feeling, which in itself has become the means of its own escape,

its own cause of ignorance, will disentangle itself from the jungle of distractions. Through becoming aware of the outward distractions—possessions, relationships, amusements, pleasures, addictions—and by thinking-feeling them out, the inner distractions—escapes, knowledge, speculations, self-protective beliefs, memories and so on—are discovered. When there is an awareness of the outer and inner distractions there comes deep understanding, and only then is there a natural and easy withdrawal from them. For thought-feeling to discipline itself not to be distracted, prevents the understanding of the nature and cause of distraction, and so discipline itself becomes an escape, a means of distraction.

Simple life does not consist in the mere possession of a few things but in the freedom from possession and non-possession, in the indifference to things that comes with deep understanding. Merely to renounce things in order to reach greater happiness, greater joy that is promised, is to seek reward which limits thought and prevents it from flowering and discovering reality. To control thought-feeling for a greater reward, for a greater result, is to make it petty, ignorant and sorrowful. Simplicity of life comes with inner richness, with inward freedom from craving, with freedom from acquisitiveness, from addiction, from distraction.

From this simple life there comes that necessary one-pointedness which is not the outcome of self-enclosing concentration but of extensional awareness and meditative understanding. Simple life is not the result of outward circumstances; contentment with little comes with the riches of inward understanding. If you depend on circumstances to make you satisfied with life then you will create misery and chaos, for then you are a plaything of environment, and it is only when circumstances are transcended through understanding that there is order and clarity. To be constantly aware of the process of acquisitiveness, of addiction, of distraction, brings freedom from them and so there is a true and simple life.

Questioner: My son was killed in this war. I have another son twelve years old and I do not want to lose him too, in another war. How is another war to be prevented?

Krishnamurti: I am sure this same question must be put by every mother and father throughout the world. It is a universal problem. And I wonder what price the parents are willing to pay to prevent another war, to prevent their sons from being killed, to prevent this appalling human slaughter; how much they really mean when they say that they love their children, that war must be prevented, that they must have brotherhood, that a way must be found to stop all wars.

To create a new way of life you must have a new revolutionary way of thinking-feeling. You will have another war, you are bound to have another war, if you are thinking in terms of nationalities, of racial prejudices, of economic and social frontiers. If each one really considers in his heart how to prevent another war he must put aside his nationality, his particular specialized religion, his greed and ambition. If you do not you will have another war for these prejudices and the adherence to specialized religions are merely the outward expressions of your selfishness, ignorance, ill will, lust.

But you will answer that it will take a very long time for each one of us to change and so to convince others of this point of view; society is not prepared to receive this idea; politicians are not interested in it; the leaders are incapable of this conception of one universal government or State without separate sovereignties. You might say that it is an evolutionary process which will gradually bring about this necessary change. If you replied in this manner to the parent whose son is going to be killed in another war and if he really loved his son, do you think he would find hope in this gradual evolutionary process? He wants to save his son, and he wants to know what is the surest way to stop all wars. He will not be satisfied with your gradual evolutionary theory. Is this evolutionary theory of gradual peace true or invented by us to rationalize our lazy and egotistic thought-feeling? Is it not incomplete and so not true? We think that we must go through the various states the family, the group, the nation and the inter-nation and then only will we have peace. It is but a justification of our egotism and narrowness, bigotry and prejudice; instead of sweeping away these dangers we invent a theory of progressive growth and sacrifice to it the happiness of others and ourselves. If we apply our mind and heart to the disease of ignorance and selfishness, then we shall create a sane and happy world.

We must not think and feel horizontally but vertically. That is instead of following the course of lazy, selfish, ignorant thought-feeling of gradualism, of slow enlightenment through the process of time, of following this stream of continual conflict and misery, of constant mass murder and a period of rest from it—called peace—and an eventual paradise on earth; instead of thinking-feeling along these horizontal lines, can we not think-feel vertically? Is it not possible to pull ourselves out of the horizontal continuance of confusion and strife and to think-feel away from it, anew, without the sense of time, vertically? Without thinking in terms of evolution which helps to rationalize our laziness and postponement, can we not think-feel directly, simply? The love of the mother thinks-feels directly and simply but her egotism, her national pride and so on help her to think-feel in terms of gradualism, horizontally.

The present is the eternal, neither the past nor the future can reveal it; through the present only the timeless is realized. If you really desire to save your son and so mankind from another war, then you must pay the price for it: not to be greedy, not to have ill will and not to be worldly; for lust, ill will and ignorance breed conflict, confusion and antagonism; they breed nationalism, pride and the tyranny of the machine. If you are willing to free yourself from lust, ill will and ignorance, then only will you save your son from another war. To bring happiness to the world, to put an end to this mass murder, there must be complete inward revolution of thought-feeling which brings about new morality, a morality not of the sensate but based on freedom from sensuality, worldliness and the craving for personal immortality.

Questioner: You talk of meditative awareness but you never talk of prayer. Are you opposed to prayer?

Krishnamurti: In opposition there is no understanding. Most of us indulge in petitionary prayer and this form of prayer cultivates, strengthens duality, the observer and the observed, which are a joint phenomenon. Only when this duality ceases is there the whole. However much you may petition your answer will be according to your demand, but it will not be of the real. The answer to a desire is in the desire itself. When the mind-heart is utterly still, utterly silent, then only is there the whole, the eternal.

Some time ago I saw a person who said he had been praying to God and one of his petitions was for a refrigerator. Please do not laugh. And he had acquired not only a refrigerator but also a house, so his prayers were answered and God was a reality, he asserted.

When you ask you will receive but you will have to pay for it; according to your demands you are answered but there is a price for it. Greed replies to greed. When you ask out of greed, out of fear, out of want, you will have an answer but you must pay for it and you pay for it through wars, strife and misery. The centuries of greed, cruelty, ill will, ignorance manifest themselves when you call upon them. So to indulge in prayer without self-knowledge, without understanding, is disastrous. The meditative awareness of which I have been speaking is the outcome of self-knowledge in which alone there is right thinking, and it is this that frees the mind-heart from the dual process of the observer and the observed, for they are a joint phenomenon, a joint occurrence. The observer is ever conditioning the observed and it is extremely difficult to go beyond the observer and the observed, to go beyond and above the created. The thinker and his thought must cease for the Eternal to be.

I have been trying to explain in my talks how to clarify the confusion that exists between the observer and the observed, the thinker and his

thought, through self-knowledge and right thinking. For without self-clarification, the observer is ever conditioning the observed and so cannot go beyond himself and becomes imprisoned. He is caught in his own delusion. For the realization of that which is not created, not made up, thought-feeling must transcend the created, the result, the self; thought-feeling must cease to demand, cease to acquire, cease to be distracted by any form of ritualism and memory. If you will experiment you will discover how extremely difficult it is for thought to be wholly free from its own chattering and creation. Only when it is so free, only when the observer and the observed have ceased, is there the Immeasurable.

Questioner: I have been writing down as you suggested. I find that I cannot get beyond the trivial thoughts. Is it because the conscious mind refuses to acknowledge the subconscious cravings and demands, and so escapes into an empty blockade?

Krishnamurti: I suggested that to slow down the mind in order to examine the thought-feeling process, you should write down every thought-feeling. If one wishes to understand, for example, a machine of high revolution one has to slow it down, not stop it for then it becomes merely a dead matter; but make it turn gently, slowly, to study its structure, its movement. Likewise if we wish to understand our mind, we must slow down our thinking—not put a stop to it—slow it down in order to study it, to follow it to its fullest extent. And to do this I suggested that you should write down every thought-feeling. It is not possible to write down every thought and feeling for there are too many of them, but if you attempted to write a little every day you would soon begin to know yourself; you would begin to be aware of the many layers of your consciousness, of their interrelation and interresponse. This awareness is difficult but if you would go far you must begin near.

Now, the questioner finds his thoughts are trivial and that he cannot get beyond them. He wants to know if this triviality is the result of an escape from the deeper cravings and demands. Partly it is and also our thoughts and feelings are in themselves petty, trivial, small. The root of understanding lies through the small, the trivial. Without understanding the small, thought-feeling cannot go beyond itself. You must become aware of your trivialities, your narrowness, your prejudices to understand them, and you can understand only when there is humility, when there is neither judgment nor comparison, acceptance nor denial. Thus there is the beginning of wisdom. Most of our thought-feeling is trivial. Why not recognize and understand its cause: the self, the result of vast and petty ignorance? Just as in following a thin vein you may come upon riches so if you follow, think-out, feel-out the trivial you will find over deep treasures. The small may hide the deep but you must

follow it. The trivial if you study it gives promise of something beyond. Do not brush it aside but become aware of *every* thought-feeling for it has a significance.

The blockages may occur either because the conscious mind does not want to respond to deeper demands, which may necessitate a different course of action and so bring about trouble and pain, or it is incapable of wider and deeper thought-feeling. If it is the lack of capacity, you can create it only through persistent and constant awareness, through searching, observing, studying.

I only suggested writing down every thought-feeling as a means of cultivating this comprehensive, extensional awareness which is not the concentration of exclusion, not the concentration of self-enclosing isolation. This extensional awareness comes through understanding, not through mere judgment or comparison, denial or acceptance.

Questioner: What guarantee have I that the new faculty of which you speak will come into being?

Krishnamurti: I am afraid none whatever! This is not an investment, surely. If you are seeking surety then you will meet death but if you are uncertain, therefore adventuring, seeking, the real will be discovered. We want to be guaranteed, we want to be sure of the result before we even try for we are lazy and thoughtless and do not wish to set out on the long journey of self-discovery. We do not apply ourselves; we want enlightenment to be given to us in exchange for our effort which indicates possessive security. In security there is no discovery of the real; this search for security is self-protectiveness and in the self there is ignorance and sorrow. To understand, to discover the real, there must be the abandonment of the self; there must be negative comprehension for that which lies beyond all the cunning schemes of the self. What is discovered in the search of self-knowledge is true and it is this truth that is liberating and creative—not my guarantee that you will be liberated which would be utter folly. We are in conflict, in confusion, in sorrow and it is this suffering, not any promise of reward, that must be the compelling force to seek, to search out and to discover the real. This search must be made by each one of us and self-knowledge is to be cultivated through constant self-awareness; right thinking comes with self-knowledge which alone brings peace and understanding. The end is made distant through greed.

Questioner: Is it wrong to have a Master, a spiritual teacher on another plane of existence?

Krishnamurti: I have tried to answer the same question put in different ways at different times but apparently few wish to understand.

~~tion can brutality and fear~~
Superstition is difficult to throw off for the mind creates it and becomes its prisoner.

How difficult it is to find what is true in what one reads, in one's daily relationship and thought! Prejudice, tendency, conditioning dictate our choice; to discover what is true these must be set aside; mind must discard its own self-restricting, narrow thoughts-feelings. To discover what is true in our thoughts, feelings and actions is extremely difficult and how much more difficult it is to discern the true in a supposedly spiritual world! If we want a teacher, a guru, it is sufficiently difficult to find a physical one and how much more complex, deceptive, confusing it must be to search out a teacher in a so-called spiritual world, in another plane of existence. Even if a supposedly spiritual teacher chooses you, you are really the chooser—not the supposed teacher. If you do not understand yourself in this world of action and interaction, of lust, ill will and ignorance, how can you trust your judgment, your capacity to discern, in a supposedly spiritual world! If you do not know yourself, how can you discern what is true? How do you know that your own mind which has the power to create illusion has not created the Master, the teacher? Is it not vanity that persuades you to seek the Master and be chosen?

There is a story of a pupil going to a teacher and requesting him to lead him to the Master; the teacher said that he would only if he, the pupil, did exactly as he was told. The pupil was delighted. For seven years he was told he must live in the nearby cave and there follow the teacher's instruction. He was told that first he must sit quietly, peacefully, in concentrated thought; then in the second year he was to invite the Master into the cave; the third he was to make the Master sit with him; in the fourth he was to talk with him; in the fifth year he was to make the Master move about in the cave; in the sixth to make him leave the cave. After the sixth year the teacher asked the pupil to come out and said to him, "Now you know who the Master is."

The mind has the power to create ignorance or to discern what is true. In this search for the Master, there is always in it the desire to gain and so there arises fear; and a mind that is seeking a reward and so inviting fear, cannot understand what is true. It is the height of ignorance to think in terms of reward and punishment, of the superior and the inferior. Besides can anyone help you to discover what is true in your own thoughts-feelings? Others may point out but you yourself have to search out and discover what is true.

If you look to another to be saved from suffering and ignorance, from this chaotic and barbarous world, you will only create further confusion and ill will, further ignorance and sorrow. You are responsible for your own thoughts-feelings-actions; you alone can bring clarity and

order; you alone can save yourself from yourself; by your understanding alone can you transcend greed, ill will and ignorance.

Each one of us, here, I hope, is trying to seek the real, the imperishable, and is not to be distracted by the beauty of wayside shrines, by the trimmings of the sign post, by ritualism. There is no authority that can lead you to the ultimate reality and that reality lies in the beginning as in the end. Do not stop at the sign posts nor be caught up in the pettiness of groups, nor become enamored of the chanting, of the incense, of the ritual. The reliance on another for self-knowledge adds more ignorance, for the other is yourself. The root of understanding is hidden in yourself. The perception of the true lies in right thinking, in humility, in compassion, in simple life, not in the authority of another. The authority of another, however great, leads to further ignorance and sorrow.

July 2, 1944

IX

It is important at all times and especially in times of much suffering and confusion to find for ourselves that inward creative joy and understanding. We have to discover it for ourselves but sensuousness, prosperity and personal power, in all their different forms, prevent creative peace and happiness. If we use our energies for the gratification of the senses we will inevitably create values which will bring prosperity, worldliness, but with these come war, confusion and sorrow. If we seek personal immortality we will nourish the greed for power which expresses itself in many ways: national, racial, economic and so on, from which flow great disasters with which we are all familiar.

We have been discussing during the last eight talks these matters. It is necessary to understand ourselves, for in understanding ourselves we will begin to think rightly and in the process of right thinking we will discover what it means to live deeply and creatively and to realize that which is beyond all measure. To live fully and creatively there must be self-knowledge; and to know, there must be candor and humility, love and thought freed from fear. Virtue lies in the freedom from craving and craving brings multiplicity and repetition and makes life complex, tormenting and sorrowful.

To accept authority, especially in matters that concern right thinking, is utterly foolish. To accept authority is binding, hindering and the worship of authority is self-worship. It is a form of laziness, thoughtlessness, leading to ignorance and sorrow.

Most of us desire to have a world in which there is peace and brotherhood, in which ruthlessness and war have no place, in which there is kindness and tolerance. How are we to achieve it? To bring about right ends surely right means must be employed. If you would have tolerance, *you must be tolerant, you must put away intolerance from you.* If you would have peace, *you must use right means for it, not wrong methods, brutality and violence.* This is obvious is it not? If you would be friends with another, you must show courtesy and kindness; there must be no anger, no cause for enmity. So you must use right means to create right ends, for in the very means is the end. They are not separate; they do not lie distant. So if you would have peace in this world, you must use peaceful methods. You may have right ends but wrong means will not achieve them. Surely this is an obvious fact but unfortunately we are carried away by repetitive authority, by propaganda, by ignorance. The thing in itself is simple and clear. If you would have a *brotherly, unified world, then you must put away the causes of disruption: enmity, jealousy, acquisitiveness, nationality, racial difference, pride and so on.* But very few of us are willing to put aside our craving for power, our specialized religion, our ill will and so on; we are unwilling to abandon these and yet we want peace, a non-competitive and sane world!

You cannot have peace in the world except through peaceful means. You must eradicate in yourself the causes of enmity by right and intelligent means, by right thinking. Self-knowledge cultivates right thinking. But as most of us are ignorant of ourselves and as our thinking-feeling is self-contradictory our thought is non-existent. So we are led, driven and made to accept. Through constant awareness of every thought-feeling the ways of the self are known, and out of self-knowledge comes right thinking. Right thinking will create the right means for a sane and peaceful world.

Questioner: How am I to get rid of hate?

Krishnamurti: There are similar questions with regard to ignorance, anger, jealousy. In answering this particular question, I hope to answer the others also.

A problem cannot be solved on its own plane, on its own level. It must be understood and so dissolved from a different and deeper level of abstraction. If we wish merely to get rid of hate by suppressing it or treating it as a tiresome and interfering thing then we shall not

dissolve it; it will reoccur again and again in different forms for we are dealing with it on its own limited, petty level. But if we begin to understand its inner causes and its outer effects, and so make our thought-feeling wider and deeper, sharper and clearer, then hate will disappear naturally, for we are concerned with deeper and more important levels of thoughts-feelings.

If we are angry and if we are able to suppress it, or so control ourselves that it does not rise up again, our mind is still as small and insensitive as before. What has been gained by this effort not to be angry if our thought-feeling is still envious and fearful, narrow and enclosed? We may get rid of hate or anger, but if the mind-heart is still stupid and petty it will create again other problems and other antagonisms and so there is no end to conflict. But if we begin to be aware and so understand the causes of anger and their effects, then surely we are widening and freeing thought-feeling from ignorance and conflict. In becoming aware we shall begin to discover the causes of anger or of hate which are self-protective fears in different forms. Through awareness we discover we are angry, perhaps, because our particular belief is being attacked; on examining it further we question if belief, creed, are necessary at all. We become more aware of its wider significance; we perceive how dogmas, ideologies divide people, giving cause to antagonism, to various forms of cruel and stupid absurdities. So through this extensional awareness, through comprehension of its inward significance, anger soon fades away; through this process of self-awareness the mind has become deeper, quieter, wiser and so the causes of hate and anger have no place in it. In freeing thought-feeling from anger and hate, from greed and ill will, there comes a gentleness, the only cure. This gentleness, compassion, is not the result of suppression or substitution but is the outcome of self knowledge and right thinking.

Questioner: Do I not owe something to my race, to my nation, to my group?

Krishnamurti: What is your nation, your race? Each people say its nation, its group, its race. Out of this thoughtless assertion there is confusion and conflict, untold sorrow and degradation. You and I are one; there is neither the East nor the West. We are human beings, not labels. We have artificially created nations, races, groups in opposition to other nations, races and groups. We have created them, you and I, in our search for power and fame; in our desire to be exclusive; in our delight in those singularistic, self-enclosing cravings; through greed, ill will and ignorance we have created national, racial and economic barriers. We have artificially separated ourselves from our fellowmen. Does a thoughtful man owe something to that which is the outcome of ill will and ignorance? If you are still part of the nation, the group, the race, the result of fear and greed, then being of it you are responsible for sorrow and cruelty. Then what you are your race, your nation, your group is. Then how can you owe something to that of which you are a part? Only when you put yourself in opposition to the mass, then in your individualistic, exclusive response debt is incurred. But surely such a reaction is false for you are the group, the nation, the race; out of you it has come into being; without you it is not.

So the question is not whether you are indebted to it but how to transcend it; how to go beyond the causes that have produced this separative, exclusive existence. By asking yourself what is your duty, your karma, your relationship with the mass, with the nation, you are putting to yourself a wrong question which will have only a wrong answer.

You have created the nation in your desire for self-worship, for self-glory and any answer to that will still be conditioned by your craving. An answer to a desire is in the desire itself. So the question is how to transcend the responses of individuality, of the mass or of the nation. You can go above and beyond them only through self-awareness in which the self, the cause of conflict, antagonism and ignorance, is observed disinterestedly and so understood and dissolved. The price of right thinking is its own reward.

Questioner: Are there different paths to Reality?

Krishnamurti: Would you not put the question differently? Each one of us has several tendencies, each tendency creating its own difficulties. In each one of us there is a dominant tendency, intellectual, emotional or sensuous; a tendency towards knowledge, devotion or action. Each has its own complexity and trial. If you pursue one exclusively,

rejecting the others, you will not discover completeness, reality; but by becoming aware of the difficulties of each tendency, thus understanding them, the whole is realized. When we ask if there are not different paths to reality, do we not mean the difficulties and hindrances which each tendency meets with and how they are transcended so as to discover the real? To transcend them you have to become aware of each tendency and watch it with disinterested passive alertness; and through understanding its conflicts and trials go beyond and above it. Through constant meditative awareness these various tendencies with their hindrances and joys are understood and made whole.

July 9, 1944

X

I have been saying that to lay emphasis on the immediate does not solve the very complex human problem. I mean by the immediate, the urgent consideration of the senses and their gratification. That is, to lay emphasis on the economic and social values instead of on the primary and eternal, leads to distorted and terrible actions. The immediate becomes the future when sensate values and their gratifications are promised by sacrificing the present; when the present is sacrificed in the hope of a future happiness or of a future economic well-being, then is the beginning of cruel thoughtlessness and disaster. Such emphasis must inevitably lead to further chaos for in giving importance to that which is secondary, we miss the whole, the real, and so bring about confusion and misery. Each one must become aware, must think out and feel out for himself what is involved in giving primary importance to the gratification of sensory desires. To yield to the values of the senses is to ultimately bring about war, economic and social catastrophes. To seek enrichment in things, made by hand or by mind, is to create inward poverty which brings untold misery. Accumulation and its importance deprives thought-feeling of the realization of the real which alone will bring order, clarity and happiness.

If one seeks first to cultivate the inner, the real, then the secondary, the economic and social order will come wisely into being; otherwise there will be constant economic and social upheavals, wars and confusion. In seeking the Eternal we will be able to bring order and clarity.

The part is never the whole and the cultivation of the part brings ceaseless confusion, conflict and antagonism.

To comprehend the whole we must first understand ourselves. The root of understanding lies in oneself and without the understanding of oneself there is no comprehension of the world; for the world is oneself. The other, the friend, the relation, the enemy, the neighbor, near or far, is yourself.

Self-knowledge is the beginning of right thinking and in the process of self-knowledge the Infinite is discovered. The book of self-knowledge has no beginning and no end. It is a constant process of discovery and what is discovered is true and truth is liberating, creative. If in that process of self-understanding we seek a result, such a result is binding, enclosing and hindering and so the Immeasurable, the Timeless is not discovered. To seek a result is to search out value which is to cultivate craving and so to engender ignorance, conflict and sorrow. If we are seeking to understand, to read this complex rich book, then we will discover its infinite riches. To read this book of self-knowledge is to become aware. Through self-awareness each thought-feeling is examined without judgment and thus allowed to flower which brings understanding; for in following each thought-feeling fully we will find that in it all thinking is contained. We can think-feel completely only when we are not seeking a result, an end.

In this process of self-knowledge right thinking comes into being; and right thinking frees the mind from craving. The freedom from craving is virtue. Mind must free itself from craving, the cause of ignorance and sorrow. For the mind to be virtuous, to be free from craving, complete candor, honesty, which comes with humility, is essential. And such integrity is not a virtue, not an end in itself but is a by-product of thought freeing itself from the process of craving, which principally expresses itself in sensuality, in prosperity or worldliness, in personal immortality or fame. Thought in freeing itself from craving will comprehend the nature of fear and so in transcending it there will be love which is in itself eternal. Simple life does not consist merely with the contentment of a few things but rather in the freedom from acquisitiveness, dependence and distraction, inner and outer. Through constant awareness the time-binder, the identifying process of memory which builds up the self, is thus dissolved. Only then can the ultimate reality come into being.

To understand oneself, this complex entity, is most difficult. A mind that is burdened with value and prejudice, judgment and comparison cannot comprehend itself. Self-knowledge comes with choiceless awareness and when craving no longer distorts thought-feeling then in that fullness, when the mind is utterly still, creatively empty, the Highest is.

Questioner: I had a son who was killed in this war. He did not want to die. He wanted to live and prevent this horror being repeated. Was it my fault that he was killed?

Krishnamurti: It is the fault of every one of us that this present horror is going on. It is the outward result of our every day inner life of greed, ill will and lust, of competition, acquisitiveness and specialized religion. It is the fault of everyone who, indulging in these, has created this terrible calamity. Because we are nationalistic, singularistic, passionate, each one of us is contributing to this mass murder. You have been taught how to kill and how to die, but not how to live. If you wholeheartedly abhorred killing and violence in any form then you would find ways and means to live peacefully and creatively. If that were your chief and primary interest then you would search out every cause, every instinct that makes for violence, for hatred, for mass murder. Are you so wholeheartedly interested in stopping war? If you are then you must eradicate in yourself the causes of violence and killing for any reason whatsoever. If you wish to stop wars then there must take place a deep, inner revolution of tolerance and compassion; then thought-feeling must free itself from patriotism, from its identification with any group, from greed and those causes that breed enmity.

A mother told me that to give up these things would not only be extremely difficult but also would mean great loneliness and utter isolation which she could not face. So was she not responsible for untold misery? You might agree with her and so by your laziness, thoughtlessness, add fuel to the ever increasing flames of war. If, on the contrary, you attempted seriously to eradicate the causes of enmity and violence in yourself, there would be peace and joy in your heart which would have immediate effect about you.

We must re-educate ourselves not to murder, not to liquidate each other for any cause however righteous it may appear to be for the future happiness of mankind, for an ideology however promising; not merely be educated technically, which inevitably makes for ruthlessness; but to be content with little, to be compassionate and to seek the Supreme.

The prevention of this ever increasing destruction and horror depends on each one of us, not on any organization or planning, not on any ideology, not on the inventions of greater instruments of destruction, not on any leader but on each one of us. Do not think that wars cannot be stopped by so humble and lowly a beginning—a stone may alter the course of a river—to go far you must begin near. To understand the world chaos and misery you must comprehend your own confusion and sorrow, for out of these come the magnified issues of the world. To understand yourself there must be constant meditative awareness which

will bring to the surface the causes of violence and hate, greed and ambition, and by studying them without identification, thought will transcend them. For none can lead you to peace save yourself; there is no leader, no system that can bring war, exploitation, oppression to an end save yourself. Only by your thoughtfulness, by your compassion, by your awakened understanding can there be established good will and peace.

Questioner: Though you explained last week how to get rid of hate, would you mind going into it again as I feel that what you said was of great importance.

Krishnamurti: Hate is the result of a petty mind, of a small mind. A narrow mind is intolerant. A mind that is in bondage is capable of resentment. Now, a little mind saying to itself that it must not hate still remains little. An ignorant mind is the cause of enmity and of conflict.

So the problem then is not how to get rid of hate but rather how to destroy ignorance, the self, that causes narrow thought-feeling. If you merely overcome hate without understanding the ways of ignorance then that ignorance will produce other forms of antagonism, and so thought-feeling will be violent and ever in conflict. How then are you to free the mind from ignorance, from stupidity? Through constant awareness; by becoming aware that your thought-feeling is small, petty and narrow and not being ashamed of it, by understanding the causes that have made it little and self-enclosed. In understanding the deep and extensional causes, intelligence, disinterested generosity and kindness come into being and hate yields to compassion. Through constant awareness the cause of ignorance, the process of the self, with its burden of the me and the mine, my achievement, my country, my possessions, my god, is being discovered, understood and dissolved. To understand there must be no judgment or comparison, no acceptance or denial, for all identification prevents that passive awareness in which alone the discovery of what is true is made. And it is this discovery that is creative and liberating. If the mind is aware negatively, passively, then being open it is able to discover the bondage, the limiting influence or idea, and so free itself from them.

So no problem can be solved on its own level; it is to be solved on a different level of abstraction. Thinking is a process of expansion, of inclusive inquiry, not a concentrated denial or assertion. In trying to understand hate and its causes, in trying to free thought-feeling from hindrances, from delusions, mind becomes deeper and more extensive. In the greater the lesser ceases to be.

Questioner: Is there anything after death or is it the end? Some say there is continuation, others annihilation. What do you say?

Krishnamurti: In this question many things are involved; and as it is complex we will have to go into it, if you wish, deeply and openly. First of all, what do we mean by individuality? For we are not considering death abstractly but the death of an individual, of the particular. Will the individual self with name and form continue, or will he cease to exist? Will he take birth again? Before we can answer this question we must find what makes up individuality. A wrong question has no right answer; only a right question may have an answer. And all questions concerning the deep problems of life have no categorical answer for each one must discover what is true for himself. Truth alone gives freedom.

Is not individuality, though it may have a different form and name, the result of a series of accumulated responses and memories from the past, from yesterday? Each one of us is the result of the past and the past contains the you and the many, the you and the other. You are the result of your father and mother, of all the fathers and mothers; you are the father, the maker of the past, the father of the future. Thus through identifying memory the self is created, the me and the mine; so the self becomes the time-binder. From this arises the question of whether the self continues or is annihilated after death. Only when the self, the becomer and the non-becomer, the creator of the past, the present and the future, the time-binder, is transcended, then only is there that which is deathless, timeless.

In this there is also the question of cause and effect. Are cause and effect separate or is effect within the cause? They flow together, they exist together and they are a joint phenomenon, not to be separated. Though effect may take "time" to come into being, the seed of effect is in the cause, it co-exists with the cause. It is no longer cause and effect but a much more subtle, delicate problem to be thought out, to be experienced. Cause-effect becomes the means of restricting, conditioning consciousness and these restrictions produce conflict and sorrow. These restrictions, subtle and inward, must be self-discovered and understood which will ultimately free thought from ignorance and pain.

In this question of birth and death, of continuity and annihilation, is there not implied progress, gradualism? Do not some of us think that gradually, through repeated birth and death, through time, the self, becoming more and more perfect, will ultimately realize supreme bliss? Is the self a permanent entity, a spiritual essence? Is the self not made up, put together and so impermanent? Is not the self a result and so, in itself, not a spiritual essence? Has not the self a continuity through identifying memory, subject to time, and therefore impermanent and transitory? That which is in itself impermanent, put together, a result, how can it reach the causeless, the eternal? That which is the cause of

ignorance and sorrow, how can it attain supreme bliss? That which is the product of time, how can it know the timeless?

Realizing the impermanency of the self, there are those who say the permanent is to be found by throwing off the many layers of the self which requires time and so to reincarnate is necessary. The self, the result of craving, the cause of ignorance and sorrow, continues, as we observe; but to understand it and to transcend it we must not think in terms of time. Through time the timeless is not realized. Is not this approach to reality through gradualism, through slow evolutionary process, through birth and death, erroneous? Is it not the rationalization of conditioned thought, of postponement, of laziness and ignorance? This idea of gradualism exists, does it not, because we do not think-feel directly and simply? We choose a satisfactory explanation, a rationalization of our confused and lazy effort. Through conditioned thinking, through postponement can the real be discovered? The self, the cause of ignorance and sorrow, can it gradually through time become perfect? Or through time can the self dissolve itself? That which is in its very nature the cause of ignorance, can it become enlightened? Must it not cease to be before there can be light? Is its cessation a matter of time, a horizontal process, or is enlightenment only possible when thought-feeling abandons this horizontal process of time and so can think-feel vertically, directly? Along this horizontal path of time, of postponement, of ignorance, truth is not; it is to be found vertically at any point along the horizontal process if thought-feeling can step out of it, freeing itself from craving and time. This freedom is not dependent on time but on the intensity of awareness and the fullness of self-knowledge.

Must thought go through the stages of the family, the group, the nation, the inter-nation to come to the realization of human unity? Is it not possible to think-feel directly the human unity, without going through these stages? We are prevented, are we not, by our conditioning? If we rationalize our conditioning and so accept it then we shall never realize human unity so shall have ceaseless wars and terrible disasters. We rationalize our conditioning because it is easier to accept what is, to be lazy, to be thoughtless than vigorously to examine it, to discover what is true. We are afraid to examine for it might reveal hidden fears, bring greater conflicts and suffering, force us to pursue actions that might bring uncertainty, insecurity, isolation and so on. So we accept our conditioning, inventing a theory of gradual growth towards ultimate human unity, and force all thought-feeling-action to conform to our gratifying theory.

Similarly do we not gratifyingly accept this theory of gradualism, of evolutionary growth toward perfection? Do we not accept it because it soothes our anxious fear of death, of insecurity, of the unknown? In

accepting it conditioning takes place and we become slaves to wrong ideas, to false hopes. We must break through these conditionings not in time, not in the future, but in the ever present. In the present is the Eternal.

Only right thinking can free our thought-feeling from ignorance and sorrow; right thinking is not the result of time but of becoming intensely aware in the present of all conditioning which prevents clarity and understanding.

The realization of that which is immortal, deathless, does not lie along the path of self-continuity, nor is it in its opposite. In the opposites there is conflict but not truth. Through self-awareness and in the clarity of self-knowledge there comes right thinking. The capacity to realize truth is with us. In cultivating right thinking which comes with self-knowledge, thought-feeling unfolds into the real, into the timeless.

I shall be told that I have not answered the question, that I have evaded it, gone round about it. What would you have me say—that there is or that there is not? Is it not more important to know how to discover for yourself what is true than to be told what is? The one will be merely verbal and so of little significance while the other will bring true experience and so is of great importance. But if I assert merely that there is continuity or that there is not, such a statement will only strengthen belief and that is the very thing that stands in the way of the real. What is necessary is to go beyond our narrow beliefs and formulations, our cravings and hopes to experience that which is deathless and timeless.

Questioner: Will not the scientists save the world?

Krishnamurti: What do we mean by the scientists? Those who work in the laboratories and outside of them are human beings like us, with national and racial prejudices, greedy, ambitious, cruel. Will they save? Are they saving the world? Are they not using their technical knowledge to destroy more than to heal? In their laboratories they may be seeking knowledge and understanding but are they not driven by the self, by competitive spirit, by passions like other human beings?

One has to be on guard, alertly watchful of an organized group; the more you are organized, controlled, shaped the more you are incapable of thinking wholly, completely. You are thinking then in part which brings calamity and misery. One has to be watchful of the professionals; they have their vested interests, their narrow demands. One has to be on guard with the specialists along any line. Through the specialization of the part the whole is not understood. The more you rely on them and leave the deliverance of the world from misery and chaos to them the more confusion and catastrophes there will be. For who is to save you

except yourself? For the leader, the party, the system is created in your being and what you are, they are; if you are ignorant and violent, competitive and acquisitive, they will represent what you are.

The scientists and the laymen are ourselves; we think in part, rejecting the whole; thoughtlessly we allow ourselves to be fashioned by lust, by ill will and ignorance. Through fear and dependence we allow ourselves to be regimented, oppressed. What can save us except our own capacity to free ourselves from those bondages which bring about conflict and misery? None can re-educate us save ourselves and this re-education is an arduous task.

In ourselves is the whole, the beginning and the end. We find the book of self-knowledge difficult to read and being impatient and greedy for results we turn to the scientists, to the organized groups, to the professionals, to the leaders. So we are never saved, none can deliver us, for deliverance from ignorance and sorrow comes through our own understanding. To re-educate ourselves is a strenuous task demanding constant awareness and great pliability, not opinion and dogma but understanding. To understand the world each one must understand himself, for he is the world; out of self-knowledge comes right thinking. It is right thinking alone that will bring order, clarity and creative peace. To think-feel anew of the pain of existence each one must become aware so as to think out, feel out each thought-feeling and this is prevented if there is identification or judgment.

Questioner: I am not particularly interested in nationality nor in virtue. But I am greatly impressed by what you say about the uncreated. Will you please go into it a little more, though it is difficult.

Krishnamurti: You cannot pick and choose; for nationality, virtue and the uncreated are interrelated. You may not accept what pleases and reject what is unpleasant; the pleasant and the unpleasant, ritualism and sorrow, virtue and evil are interrelated; to choose the one and reject the other is to be caught in the net of ignorance.

To think about the uncreated without the mind truly freeing itself from craving is to indulge in superstition and speculation. To experience the uncreated, the immeasurable, mind must cease to create. It must cease to be acquisitive, must free itself from ill will, from copy. Mind must cease to be the storehouse of accumulated memories. That which we worship is our creation and so it is not the real. The thinker and his thought must come to an end for the uncreated to be.

The uncreated can only be when the mind is capable of utter stillness. A mind that is riven, burning with craving, is never tranquil. There is no virtue if thought is not free from craving. When thought begins to free itself from craving there is right thinking. It is right thinking that

will ultimately bring about clarity of perception. Surely there is a difference between that which is thinkable and that which is experienceable. Out of formulation, out of imagination, out of the known we experience, but few are capable of experiencing without symbols, without imagination, without formulations. Negative understanding frees the mind from copy, from the created. Our minds are filled with memories, with knowledge, with action and response to relationship and things. There is no inward rich stillness without pretention and desire and so there is no creative emptiness. A mind rich in activity, rich in possession, rich in memory is not aware of its own poverty. Such a mind is incapable of negative comprehension; such a mind is incapable of experiencing the uncreated. Supreme wisdom is denied to it.

Questioner: Is not the practice of a regular discipline necessary?

Krishnamurti: A dancer or a violinist practises many hours a day so as to keep his fingers supple, his muscles flexible. Now, do you keep your mind pliable, thoughtful, compassionate, by practising any particular system of discipline? Or do you keep it alert, keen by constant awareness of thought-feeling? To think, to feel is not to belong to any system. We cease to think if we think in terms of systems and because we think within systems our thought needs strengthening. A system will only produce a specialized form of thought but it is not thinking, is it? Mere practice of a discipline to gain a result only strengthens thought to function in a groove and thereby limits it; but if we become aware and realize that we are thinking in terms of systems, formulas and patterns then thought-feeling, in freeing itself from them, is beginning to become pliable, alert and keen. If we can think every thought through, go with it as far as we can, then we shall be capable of understanding and experiencing widely and deeply. This expansive and deep awareness brings its own discipline, a discipline not imposed outwardly or inwardly according to any system or pattern but the outcome of self-knowledge and therefore of right thinking and understanding. Such discipline is creative without forming habit and encouraging laziness.

If you become aware of every thought-feeling, however trivial, and think it out, feel it out as deeply and extensively as possible, thought then breaks down the limitations it has imposed upon itself. Thus there comes an understanding adjustment, a discipline far more effective and pliable than the imposed discipline of any pattern. Without awakening the highest intelligence through awareness practice of a discipline merely creates habit, thoughtlessness. Awareness itself through self-knowledge and right thinking brings its own discipline. Habit, thoughtlessness as a means to an end makes of the end into ignorance. Right means create right ends for the end exists in the means.

Questioner: How am I to still the mind in which it may be possible to realize something which will affect daily problems? How am I also to retain the still mind?

Krishnamurti: Just as a lake is calm when the breezes stop so when the mind has understood and thus transcended the conflicting problems it has created, great stillness comes into being. This tranquillity is not to be induced by will, by desire; it is the outcome of the freedom from craving.

Most of our so-called meditation consists in stilling the mind by various methods which only further strengthens self-enclosing, exclusive concentration; such narrowing concentration brings its own result but it is not extensional understanding, not the highest intelligence and wisdom which bring naturally, without compulsion, tranquillity. This understanding is to be awakened, cultivated through constant awareness of every thought-feeling-action, of every disturbance whether small or great. In understanding and so dissolving the conflicts and the disturbances which are in the conscious mind, in the external layer, and thus bringing clarity, it is able then to be passive and so understand the deeper, the interrelated layers of consciousness with their accumulations, impressions, memories. Thus through constant awareness the deep process of craving, the cause of self and so of conflict and pain, is observed and understood. Without self-knowledge and right thinking there is no meditation and without meditative awareness there is no self-knowledge.

July 16, 1944

Reprinted and made
in Great Britain by
William McEellan & Co Ltd
248 Hope Street
Glasgow, C 2

*Authentic Report of Sixteen Talks'
given in 1945 & 1946 by*

Krishnamurti

OAK GROVE, OJAI

*Authentic Report of Sixteen Talks
given in 1945 & 1946 by*

Krishnamurti

OAK GROVE, OJAI

Copyright 1947 by Krishnamurti Writings, Inc.

Published by
KRISHNAMURTI WRITINGS, INC.
Ojai, California

Translation and all rights reserved
Printed in the United States of America

This book of Talks, like our previous publications, contains reports of spontaneous discourses about life and reality, given at different times, and is not intended, therefore, to be read through consecutively or hurriedly as a novel or as a systematized philosophical treatise.

These Talks were written down by me immediately after they were given and later I carefully revised them for publication. Unfortunately, a few individuals, unasked, circulated their own notes of some of these Talks but those reports should in no way be considered authentic or correct. To prevent misrepresentation and maintain the accuracy of these teachings we inform those who may be seriously interested that only the publications of Krishnamurti Writings, Inc. are reliable and authentic.

J. Krishnamurti

To understand the confusion and misery that exist in ourselves, and so in the world, we must first find clarity within ourselves and this clarity comes about through right thinking. This clarity is not to be organized for it cannot be exchanged with another. Organized group thought becomes dangerous however good it may appear; organized group thought can be used, exploited; group thought ceases to be right thinking, it is merely repetitive. Clarity is essential for without it change and reform merely lead to further confusion. Clarity is not the result of verbal assertion but of intense self-awareness and right thinking. Right thinking is not the outcome of mere cultivation of the intellect, nor is it conformity to pattern, however worthy and noble. Right thinking comes with self-knowledge. Without understanding yourself, you have no basis for thought; without self-knowledge what you think is not true. 1

You and the world are not two different entities with separate problems; you and the world are one. Your problem is the world's problem. You may be the result of certain tendencies, of environmental influences, but you are not different fundamentally from another. Inwardly we are very much alike; we are all driven by greed, ill-will, fear, ambition and so on. Our beliefs, hopes, aspirations have a common basis. We are one; we are one humanity, though the artificial frontiers of economics and politics and prejudice divide us. If you kill another, you are destroying yourself. You are the center of the whole and without understanding yourself you cannot understand Reality.

We have an intellectual knowledge of this unity but we keep knowledge and feeling in different compartments and hence we never experience the extraordinary unity of man. When knowledge and feeling meet there is experience. These talks will be utterly useless if you do not experience as you are listening. Do not say, I will understand later, but experience now. Do not keep your knowledge and your feeling separate for out of this separation grow confusion and misery. You must experience this living unity of man. You are not separate from the Japanese, the Hindu, the Negro or the German. To experience this immense unity be open, become conscious of this division between knowledge and feeling; do not be a slave to compartmental philosophy.

Without self-knowledge understanding is not possible. Self-knowledge is extremely arduous and difficult, for you are a complex entity. You must approach the understanding of the self simply, without any pretensions, without any theories. If I would understand you I must have no preconceived formulations about you,

there must be no prejudice; I must be open, without judgment, without comparison. This is very difficult for, with most of us, thought is the result of comparison, of judgment. Through approximation we think we are understanding, but is understanding born of comparison, judgment? Or is it the outcome of non-comparative thought? If you would understand something do you compare it with something else or do you study it for itself?

Thought born of comparison is not right thinking. Yet in studying ourselves we are comparing, approximating. It is this that prevents the understanding of ourselves. Why do we judge ourselves? Is not our judgment the outcome of our desire to become something, to gain, to conform, to protect ourselves? This very urge prevents understanding.

As I said, you are a complex entity, and to understand it you must examine it. You cannot understand it if you are comparing it with the yesterday or with the tomorrow. You are an intricate mechanism but comparison, judgment, identification prevent comprehension. Do not be afraid that you will become sluggish, smug, self-contented if you do not compete in comparison. Once you have perceived the futility of comparison there is a great freedom. Then you are no longer striving to become but there is freedom to understand. Be aware of this comparative process of your thinking—experience all this as I am explaining—and feel its futility, its fundamental thoughtlessness; you will then experience a great freedom, as though you had laid down a wearisome burden. In this freedom from approximation and so from identification, you will be able to discover and understand the realities of yourself. If you do not compare, judge, then you will be confronted with yourself and this will give clarity and strength to uncover great depths. This is essential for the understanding of Reality. When there is no self-approximation then thought is liberated from duality; the problem and the conflict with the opposites fall away. In this freedom there is a revolutionary, creative understanding.

There is not one of us who is not confronted with the problem of killing and non-killing, violence and non-violence. Some of you may feel that as your sons, brothers or husbands are not involved in this mass murder, called war, you are not immediately concerned with this problem, but if you will look a little more closely you will see how deeply you are involved. You cannot escape it. You must, as an individual, have a definite attitude towards killing and non-killing. If you have not been aware of it you are being confronted with it now; you must face the issue, the dualistic problem of capitalism and communism, love and hate, killing and non-killing and so on. How are you to find the truth of the matter? Is there any release from conflict in the endless corridor of duality? Many believe that in the very struggle of the opposites there is creativeness, that this conflict is life, and to escape from it is to be in illusion. Is this

so? Does not an opposite contain an element of its own opposite and so produce endless conflict and pain? Is conflict necessary for creation? Are the moments of creativeness the outcome of strife and pain? Does not the state of creative being come into existence when all pain and struggle have utterly ceased? You can experience this for yourself. This freedom from opposites is not an illusion; in it alone is the answer to all of our confusion and conflicting problems.

You are faced with the problem of killing your brother in the name of religion, of peace, of country and so on. How shall you find the answer in which further conflicting, further opposing problems are not inherent? To find a true, lasting answer, must you not go outside of the dualistic pattern of thought? You kill because your property, your safety, your prestige are threatened; as with the individual so with the group, with the nation. To be free from violence and non-violence there must be freedom from acquisitiveness, ill-will, lust and so on. But most of us do not go into the problem deeply and are satisfied with reform, with alteration within the pattern of duality. We accept as inevitable this conflict of duality and within that pattern try to bring about modification, change; within it we maneuver to a better position, to a more advantageous point for ourselves. Change or reform merely within the pattern of duality produces only further confusion and pain / and hence is retrogression—

You must go beyond the pattern of duality to solve permanently the problem of opposites. Within the pattern there is no truth, however much we may be caught in it; if we seek truth in it we will be led to many delusions. We must go beyond the dualistic pattern of the I and the not I, the possessor and the possessed. Beyond and above the endless corridor of duality lies Truth. Beyond and above the conflicting and painful problem of opposites lies creative understanding. This is to be experienced, not to be speculated upon; not to be formulated but to be realized through deep awareness of the dualistic hindrances.

Questioner: I am sure most of us have seen authentic pictures in movies and in magazines of the horrors and the barbarities of the concentration camps. What should be done, in your opinion, with those who have perpetrated these monstrous atrocities? Should they not be punished?

Krishnamurti: Who is to punish them? Is not the judge often as guilty as the accused? Each one of us has built up this civilization, each one has contributed towards its misery; each one is responsible for its actions. We are the outcome of each other's actions and reactions; this civilization is a collective result. No country or people is separate from another; we are all interrelated; we are one. Whether we acknowledge it or not, when a misfortune

happens to a people, we share in it as in its good fortune. You may not separate yourself to condemn or to praise.

The power to oppress is evil and every group that is large and well organized becomes a potential source of evil. By shouting loudly the cruelties of another country you think you can overlook those of your own. It is not only the vanquished but every country that is responsible for the horrors of war. War is one of the greatest catastrophes; the greatest evil is to kill another. Once you admit such an evil into your heart then you let loose countless minor disasters. You do not condemn war itself but him who is cruel in war.

You are responsible for war; you have brought it about by your everyday action of greed, ill-will, passion. Each one of us has built up this competitive, ruthless civilization, in which man is against man. You want to root out the causes of war, of barbarity in others, while you yourself indulge in them. This leads to hypocrisy and to further wars. You have to root out the causes of war, of violence, in yourself, which demands patience and gentleness, not bloody condemnation of others.

Humanity does not need more suffering to make it understand but what is needed is that you should be aware of your own actions, that you should awaken to your own ignorance and sorrow and so bring about in yourself compassion and tolerance. You should not be concerned with punishments and rewards but with the eradication in yourself of those causes that manifest themselves in violence and in hate, in antagonism and ill-will. In murdering the murderer you become like him; you become the criminal. A wrong is not righted through wrong means; only through right means can a right end be accomplished. If you would have peace you must employ peaceful means, and mass murder, war, can only lead to further murder, further suffering. There can be no love through bloodshed; an army is not an instrument of peace. Only good will and compassion can bring peace to the world, not might and cunning nor mere legislation.

You are responsible for the misery and disaster that exist, you who in your daily life are cruel, oppressive, greedy, ambitious. Suffering will continue till you eradicate in yourself those causes that breed passion, greed and ruthlessness. Have peace and compassion in your heart and you will find the right answer to your questions.

Questioner: At this time and in our present way of life our feelings become blunted and hard. Can you suggest a way of life that will make us more sensitive? Can we become so in spite of noise, haste, all the competitive professions and pursuits? Can we become so without dedication to a higher source of life?

Krishnamurti: Is it not necessary for clear and right thinking to be sensitive? To feel deeply must not the heart be open? Must not the body be healthy to respond eagerly? We blunt our minds, our feelings, our bodies, with beliefs and ill-will, with strong and hardening stimulants. It is essential to be sensitive, to respond keenly and rightly but we become blunted, hard, through our appetites. There is no separate entity such as the mind, apart from the organism as a whole, and when the organism as a whole is ill-treated, wasted, distracted, then insensitivity sets in. Our environment, our present way of life blunts us, wastes us. How can you be sensitive when every day you indulge in reading or seeing pictures of the slaughter of thousands—this mass murder reported as though it were a successful game. First time you read the reports you may feel sick at heart but the constant repetition of brutal ruthlessness dulls your mind-heart, immunizing you to the utter barbarism of modern society. The radios, magazines, cinemas are ever wasting your sensitive pliability; you are forced, threatened, regimented and how can you, in the midst of this noise, haste and false pursuits remain sensitive for the cultivation of right thinking?

If you would not have your feelings blunted and hard, you must pay the price for it; you must abandon haste, distraction, wrong professions and pursuits. You must become aware of your appetites, your limiting environment, and by rightly understanding them you begin to re-awaken your sensitivity. Through constant awareness of your thoughts-feelings, the causes of self-enclosure and narrowness fall away. If you would be highly sensitive and clear, you must deliberately work for it; you cannot be worldly and yet be pure in the pursuit of Reality. Our difficulty is we want both, the burning appetites and the serenity of Reality. You must abandon the one or the other; you cannot have both. You cannot indulge and yet be alert; to be keenly aware there must be freedom from those influences that are crystallizing, blunting.

We have over developed the intellect at the cost of our deeper and clearer feelings and a civilization that is based on the cultivation of the intellect must bring about ruthlessness and the worship of success. The emphasis on intellect or on emotion leads to unbalance, and intellect is ever seeking to safeguard itself. Mere determination only strengthens the intellect and blunts and hardens it; it is ever self-aggressive in becoming or not-becoming. The ways of the intellect must be understood through constant awareness and its reeducation must transcend its own reasoning.

Questioner: I find there is conflict between my occupation and my relationship. They go in different directions. How can I make them meet?

Krishnamurti: Most of our occupations are dictated by tradi-

tion, or by greed, or by ambition. In our occupation we are ruthless, competitive, deceitful, cunning and highly self-protective. If we weaken at any time we may go under, so we must keep up with the high efficiency of the greedy machine of business. It is a constant struggle to maintain a hold, to become sharper and cleverer. Ambition can never find lasting satisfaction; it is ever seeking wider fields for self-assertiveness.

But in relationship quite a different process is involved. In it there must be affection, consideration, adjustment, self-denial, yielding; not to conquer but to live happily. In it there must be self-effacing tenderness, freedom from domination, from possessiveness; but emptiness and fear breed jealousy and pain in relationship. Relationship is a process of self-discovery, in which there is wider and deeper understanding; relationship is a constant adjustment in self-discovery. It demands patience, infinite pliability and a simple heart.

But how can the two meet together, self-assertiveness and love, occupation and relationship? The one is ruthless, competitive, ambitious, the other is self-denying, considerate, gentle; they cannot come together. With one hand people deal in blood and money, and with the other they try to be kind, affectionate, thoughtful. As a relief from their thoughtless and dull occupations they seek comfort and ease in relationship. But relationship does not yield comfort for it is a distinctive process of self-discovery and understanding. The man of occupation tries to seek through his life of relationship comfort and pleasure as a compensation for his wearisome business. His daily occupation of ambition, greed and ruthlessness lead step by step to war and to the barbarities of modern civilization.

Right occupation is not dictated by tradition, greed or ambition. If each one is seriously concerned in establishing right relationship, not only with one but with all, then he will find right occupation. Right occupation comes with regeneration, with the change of heart, not with the mere intellectual determination to find it.

Integration is only possible if there is clarity of understanding on all the different levels of our consciousness. There can be no integration of love and ambition, deception and clarity, compassion and war. So long as occupation and relationship are kept apart, so long will there be endless conflict and misery. All reformation within the pattern of duality is retrogression; only beyond it, is there creative peace.

We are confronted every day, are we not, with dualistic problems, problems which are not theoretical or philosophical but actual? Verbally, emotionally, intellectually, we face them every day; good and bad, mine and yours, collectivism and individualism, becoming and non-becoming, worldliness and non-worldliness, and so on; an endless corridor of opposites in which thought-feeling shuffles back and forth. Are these problems of greed and non-greed, war and peace to be solved within the dualistic pattern or must thought-feeling go above and beyond to find a permanent answer? Within the pattern of duality there is no lasting answer. Each opposite has an element of its own opposite and so there can never be a permanent answer within the conflict of the opposites. There is a permanent, unique answer only outside of the pattern.

It is important to understand this problem of duality as deeply as possible. I am not dealing with it as an abstract, theoretical subject, but as an actual problem of our everyday life and conduct. We are aware, are we not, that our thought is a constant struggle within the pattern of duality, of good and bad, of being and not-being, of yours and mine? In it there is conflict and pain; in it all relationship is a process of sorrow; in it there is no hope but travail. Now, is the problem of love and hate to be solved within the field of its own conflict or must thought-feeling go above and beyond its known pattern?

To find the lasting solution to the conflict of duality and to the pain involved in choice, we must be intensely aware, in silent observation of the full implication of conflict. Only then will we discover that there is a state in which the conflict of duality has ceased. There can be no integration of the opposites, greed and non-greed. He who is greedy, when he attempts to become non-greedy, is still greedy. Must he not abandon both greed and non-greed to be above and beyond the influence of both? Any becoming involves non-becoming and as long as there is becoming there must be duality with its endless conflict.

The cause of duality is desire, craving; through perception and sensation and contact there arise desire, pleasure, pain, want, non-want which in turn cause identification as mine and yours, and thus the dualistic process is set going. Is not this conflict worldliness? As long as the thinker separates himself from this thought, so long the vain conflict of the opposites will continue. As long as the thinker is concerned only with the modification of his thoughts and not with the fundamental transformation of himself, so long conflict and sorrow will continue.

Is the thinker separate from his thought? Are not the thinker and his thought an inseparable phenomenon? Why do we separate the thought from the thinker? Is it not one of the cunning tricks of the mind so that the thinker can change his garb according to circumstances, yet remain the same? Outwardly there is the appearance of change but inwardly the thinker continues to be as he is. The craving for continuity, for permanency, creates this division between the thinker and his thoughts. When the thinker and his thought become inseparable then only is duality transcended. Only then is there the true religious experience. Only when the thinker ceases is there Reality. This inseparable unity of the thinker and his thought is to be experienced but not to be speculated upon. This experience is liberation; in it there is inexpressible joy.

Right thinking alone can bring about the understanding and the transcending of cause-effect and the dualistic process; when the thinker and his thought are integrated through right meditation, then there is the ecstasy of the Real.

Questioner: These monstrous wars cry for a durable peace. Every one is speaking already of a Third World War. Do you see a possibility of averting the new catastrophe?

Krishnamurti: How can we expect to avert it when the elements and values that cause war continue? Has the war that is just over produced a deep fundamental change in man? Imperialism and oppression are still rampant, perhaps cleverly veiled; separate sovereign states continue; nations are maneuvering themselves into new positions of power; the powerful still oppress the weak; the ruling elite still exploit the ruled; social and class conflicts have not ceased; prejudice and hatred are burning everywhere. As long as professional priests with their organized prejudices justify intolerance and the liquidation of another being for the good of your country and the protection of your interests and ideologies, there will be war. As long as sensory values predominate over eternal value there will be war.

What you are the world is. If you are nationalistic, patriotic, aggressive, ambitious, greedy, then you are the cause of conflict and war. If you belong to any particular ideology, to a specialized prejudice, even if you call it religion, then you will be the cause of strife and misery. If you are enmeshed in sensory values then there will be ignorance and confusion. For what you are the world is; your problem is the world's problem.

Have you fundamentally changed because of this present catastrophe? Do you not still call yourself an American, an Englishman, an Indian, a German and so on? Are you not still greedy for position and power, for possessions and riches? Worship becomes hypocrisy when you are cultivating the causes of war; your prayers

lead you to illusion if you allow yourself to indulge in hate and in worldliness. If you do not eradicate in yourself the causes of enmity, of ambition, of greed, then your gods are false gods who will lead you to misery. Only good-will and compassion can bring order and peace to the world and not political blueprints and conferences. You must pay the price for peace. You must pay it voluntarily and happily and the price is the freedom from lust and ill-will, worldliness and ignorance, prejudice and hate. If there were such a fundamental change in you, you could help to bring about a peaceful and sane world. To have peace you must be compassionate and thoughtful.

You may not be able to avert the Third World War but you can free your heart and mind from violence and from those causes that bring about enmity and prevent love. Then in this dark world there will be some who are pure of heart and mind, and from them perhaps the seed of a true culture might come into being. Make pure your heart and mind for by your life and action only can there be peace and order. Do not be lost and confused in organizations but remain wholly alone and simple. Do not seek merely to prevent catastrophe but rather let each one deeply eradicate those causes that breed antagonism and strife.

Questioner: I have written down, as you suggested last year, my thoughts and feelings for several months, but I don't seem to get much further with it. Why? What more am I to do?

Krishnamurti: I suggested last year, as a means to self-knowledge and right thinking, that one should write down *every* thought-feeling, the pleasant as well as the unpleasant. Thus one becomes aware of the whole content of consciousness, the private thoughts and secret motives, intentions and bondages. Thus through constant self-awareness there comes self-knowledge which brings about right thinking. For without self-knowledge there can be no understanding. The source of understanding is within oneself and there is no comprehension of the world and your relationship to it without deep self-knowledge.

The questioner wants to know why he is not able to penetrate within himself deeply and discover the hidden treasure that lies beyond the superficial attempts at self-knowledge. To dig deeply you must have the right instrument, not merely the desire to dig. To cultivate self-knowledge there must be capacity and not a vague wish for it. Being and wishing are two different things.

To cultivate the right instrument of perception thought must cease to condemn, to deny, to compare and judge or to seek comfort and security. If you condemn or are gratified with what you have written down then you will put an end to the flow of thought-

feeling and to understanding. If you wish to understand what another is saying surely you must listen without any bias, without being distracted by irrelevancies. Similarly, if you wish to understand your own thoughts-feelings, you must observe them with kindly dispassion and not with an attitude of condemnation or approval. Identification prevents and perverts the flow of thought-feeling; tolerant disinterestedness is essential for self-knowledge; self-knowledge opens the door to deep and wide understanding. But it is difficult to be calm with regard to oneself, to one's reactions and so on, for we have set up a habit of self-condemnation, of self-justification and it is of this habit that one must be aware. Through constant and alert awareness, not through denial, does thought free itself from habit. This freedom is not of time but of understanding. Understanding is ever in the immediate present.

To cultivate the right instrument of perception there must be no comparison for when you compare you cease to understand. If you compare, approximate, you are being merely competitive, ambitious and your end then is success in which inherently is failure. Comparison implies a pattern of authority according to which you are measuring and guiding yourself. The oppression of authority cripples understanding. Comparison may produce a desired result but it is an impediment to self-knowledge. Comparison implies time and times does not yield understanding.

You are a complex living organism; understand yourself not through comparison but through perception of what is, for the present is the doorway to the past and to the future. When thought is free of comparison and identification and their uncreative burden, it is then able to be calm and clear. This habit of comparison, as also the habit of condemnation and approval, leads to conformity and in conformity there is no understanding.

The self is not a static entity but very active, alertly capable in its demands and pursuits; to follow and to understand the endless movement of the self a keen, pliable mind-heart is necessary, a mind capable of intense self-awareness. To understand, mind must delve deeply and yet it must know when to be alertly passive. It would be foolish and unbalanced to keep on digging without the recuperative and healing power of passivity. We search, analyze, look into ourselves, but it is a process of conflict and pain; there is no joy in it for we are judging or justifying or comparing. There are no moments of silent awareness, of choiceless passivity. It is this choiceless awareness, this creative passivity that is even more essential than self-observation and investigation. As the fields are cultivated, sown, harvested and allowed to lie fallow so must we live the four seasons in a day. If you cultivate, sow and harvest without giving rest to the soil it would soon become unproductive. The period of fallowness is as essential as tilling; when the earth lies fallow the winds, the rains, the sunshine bring to it creative pro-

ductivity and it renews itself. So must the mind-heart be silent, alertly passive after travail, to renew itself.

Thus through self-awareness of every thought-feeling the ways of the self are known and understood. This self-awareness with its self-observation and alert passivity brings deep and wide self-knowledge. From self-knowledge there comes right thinking; without right thinking there is no meditation.

Questioner: The problem of earning a decent living is predominant with most of us. Since economic currents of the world are hopelessly interdependent I find that almost anything I do either exploits others or contributes to the cause of war. How is one who honestly wishes to achieve right means of livelihood to withdraw from the wheels of exploitation and war?

Krishnamurti: For him who truly wishes to find a right means of livelihood economic life, as at present organized, is certainly difficult. As the questioner says, economic currents are interrelated and so it is a complex problem, and as with all complex human problems it must be approached with simplicity. As society is becoming more and more complex and organized, regimentation of thought and action is being enforced for the sake of efficiency. Efficiency becomes ruthlessness when sensory values predominate, when eternal value is set aside.

Obviously there are wrong means of livelihood. He who helps in manufacturing arms and other methods to kill his fellowman is surely occupied with furthering violence which never brings about peace in the world; the politician who, either for the benefit of his nation or of himself or of an ideology, is occupied in ruling and exploiting others, is surely employing wrong means of livelihood which lead to war, to the misery and sorrow of man; the priest who holds to a specialized prejudice, dogma or belief, to a particular form of worship and prayer is also using wrong means of livelihood, for he is only spreading ignorance and intolerance which set man against man. Any profession that leads to and maintains the divisions and conflict between man and man is obviously a wrong means of livelihood. Such occupations lead to exploitation and strife.

Our means of livelihood are dictated, are they not, through tradition or through greed and ambition? Generally we do not deliberately set about choosing the right means of livelihood. We are only too thankful to get what we can and blindly follow the economic system that is about us. But the questioner wants to know how to withdraw from exploitation and war. To withdraw from them he must not allow himself to be influenced, nor follow traditional occupation, nor must he be envious and ambitious. Many of us choose some profession because of tradition or because we are of

a family of lawyers or soldiers or politicians or traders; or our greed for power and position dictates our occupation; ambition drives us to compete and be ruthless in our desire to succeed. So he who would not exploit or contribute to the cause of war must cease to follow tradition, cease to be greedy, ambitious, self-seeking. If he abstains from these he will naturally find right occupation.

But though it is important and beneficial, right occupation is not an end in itself. You may have a right means of livelihood but if you are inwardly insufficient and poor you will be a source of misery to yourself and so to others; you will be thoughtless, violent, self-assertive. Without that inward freedom of Reality you will have no joy, no peace. In the search and discovery of that inward Reality alone can we be not only content with little, but aware of something that is beyond all measure. It is this which must be first sought out; then other things will come into being in its wake.

This inward freedom of creative Reality is not a gift; it is to be discovered and experienced. It is not an acquisition to be gathered to yourself to glorify yourself. It is a state of being, as silence, in which there is no becoming, in which there is completeness. This creativeness may not necessarily seek expression; it is not a talent that demands an outward manifestation. You need not be a great artist nor have an audience; if you seek these you will miss that inward Reality. It is neither a gift, nor is it the outcome of talent; it is to be found, this imperishable treasure, when thought frees itself from lust, ill-will and ignorance; when thought frees itself from worldliness and personal craving to be; it is to be experienced through right thinking and meditation. Without this inward freedom of Reality existence is pain. As a thirsty man seeks water, so must we seek. Reality alone can quench the thirst of impermanency.

Questioner: I am an inveterate smoker. I have tried several times to give it up but failed each time. How am I to give it up once and for all?

Krishnamurti: Do not strive to give it up; as with so many habits mere struggle against them only strengthens them. Understand the whole problem of habit, the mental, emotional and physical. Habit is thoughtlessness and to struggle against thoughtlessness by determined ignorance is vain, stupid. You must understand the process of habit through constant awareness of the grooves of the mind and of the habitual emotional responses. In understanding the deeper issues of habit the superficial ones fall away. Without understanding the deeper causes of habit, suppose you are able to master the habit of smoking or any other habit, you still will be as you are, thoughtless, empty, a plaything of environment.

How to give up a particular habit is surely not the primary question for much deeper things are involved. No problem can be

solved on its own level. Is any problem solved within the pattern of opposites? Obviously there is conflict within the pattern but does this conflict resolve the problem? Must you not go outside the pattern of conflict to find a lasting answer? The struggle against a habit does not necessarily result in its abandonment; other habits may be developed or substituted. The struggle merely to overcome habits, without uncovering their deeper significance, makes the mind-heart thoughtless, superficial, insensitive. As with anger, as with armies, conflict exhausts, and no major issue is solved. Similarly conflict between opposites only blunts the mind-heart and it is this dullness that prevents the understanding of the problem. Please see the importance of this. Conflict between two opposing desires must end in weariness, in thoughtlessness.

It is this thoughtlessness that must be considered, not the mere giving up of a habit or conflict. The abandonment of a habit will naturally follow if there is thoughtfulness, if there is sensitivity. This sensitivity is blunted, hardened, by the constant struggle of opposing desires. So if you want to smoke, smoke; but be intensely aware of all the implications of habit: thoughtlessness, dependency, loneliness, fear and so on. Do not merely struggle against habit but be aware of its full significance.

It is considered intelligent to be in the conflict of the opposites; the struggle between good and evil, between collectivism and individualism, is thought to be necessary for the growth of man; the conflict between God and Devil is accepted as an inevitable process. Does this conflict between the opposites lead to Reality? Does it not lead to ignorance and illusion? Is evil to be transcended by its opposite? Must not thought go above and beyond the conflict of both? This conflict of the opposites does not lead to righteousness, to understanding; it leads to weariness, thoughtlessness, insensitivity. Perhaps the criminal, the sinner may be nearer comprehension than the man who is self-righteous in his smug struggle of opposing desires. The criminal could be aware of his crime so there is hope for him, whereas the man in self-righteous conflict of the opposites is merely lost in his own petty ambition to become. The one is vulnerable while the other is enclosed, hardened by his conflict; the one is still susceptible while the other is made insensitive through the conflict and pain of constant struggle to become.

Do not lose yourself in the conflict and pain of the opposites. Do not compare and strive to become the opposite of that which you are. Be wholly, choicelessly aware of what is, of your habit, of your fear, of your tendency and in this single flame of awareness that which is is transformed. This transformation is not within the pattern of duality; it is fundamental, creative, with the breath of reality. In this flame of awareness all problems are finally resolved. Without this transformation life is a struggle and pain and there is no joy, no peace.

Is it not important to understand and so transcend conflict? Most of us live in a state of inner conflict which produces outer turmoil and confusion; many escape from conflict into illusion, into various activities, into knowledge and ideation, or become cynical and depressed. There are some who, understanding conflict, go beyond its limitations. Without understanding the inward nature of conflict, the warring field which we are, there can be no peace, no joy.

Most of us are caught up in an endless series of inward conflicts and without resolving them life is utterly wasteful and empty. We are aware of two opposing poles of desire, the wanting and the not-wanting. The conflict between comprehension and ignorance we accept as part of our nature; we do not see that it is impossible to resolve this conflict within the pattern of duality and so we accept it, making a virtue of conflict. We have come to regard it as essential for growth, for the perfecting of man. Do we not say that through conflict we shall learn, we shall understand? We give a religious significance to this conflict of opposites but does it lead to virtue, to clarification, or does it lead to ignorance, to insensitivity, to death? Have you never noticed that in the midst of conflict there is no understanding at all, only a blind struggle? Conflict is not productive of understanding. Conflict leads, as we have said, to apathy, to delusion. We must go outside the pattern of duality for creative, revolutionary understanding.

Does not conflict, the struggle to become and not to become, make for a self-enclosing process? Does it not create self-consciousness? Is not the very nature of the self one of conflict and pain? When are you conscious of yourself? When there is opposition, when there is friction, when there is antagonism. In the moment of joy, self-consciousness is non-existent; when there is happiness you do not say I am happy; only when it is absent, when there is conflict, do you become self-conscious. Conflict is a recall to oneself, an awareness of one's own limitation; it is this which causes self-consciousness. This constant struggle leads to many forms of escape, to illusion; without understanding the nature of conflict, the acceptance of authority, belief or ideology only leads to ignorance and further sorrow. With the understanding of conflict these become impotent and worthless.

Choice between opposing desires merely continues conflict; choice implies duality; through choice there is no freedom, for will is still productive of conflict. Then how is it possible for thought to go beyond and above the pattern of duality? Only when we under-

stand the ways of craving and of self-gratification is it possible to transcend the endless conflict of opposites. We are ever seeking pleasure and avoiding sorrow; the constant desire to become hardens the mind-heart, causing strife and pain. Have you not noticed how ruthless a man is in his desire to become? To become something in this world is relatively the same as becoming something in what is considered the spiritual world; in each, man is driven by the desire to become and this craving leads to incessant conflict, to peculiar ruthlessness and antagonism. Then to renounce is to acquire and acquisition is the seed of conflict. This process of renouncing and acquiring, of becoming and not becoming is an endless chain of sorrow.

How to go beyond and above this conflict is our problem. This is not a theoretical question but one that confronts us almost all of the time. We can escape into some fancy which can be rationalized and made to seem real but nevertheless it is delusion; it is not made real by cunning explanations nor by the number of its adherents. To transcend conflict the craving to become must be experienced and understood. The desire to become is complex and subtle but as with all complex things it must be approached simply. Be intensely aware of the desire to become. Be aware of the feeling of becoming; with feeling there comes sensitivity which begins to reveal the many implications of becoming. Feeling is hardened by the intellect and by its many cunning rationalizations, and however much the intellect may unravel the complexity of becoming it is incapable of experiencing. You may verbally grasp all this but it will be of little consequence; only experience and feeling can bring the creative flame of understanding.

Do not condemn becoming but be aware of its cause and effect in yourself. Condemnation, judgment and comparison do not bring the experience of understanding; on the contrary they will stop experience. Be aware of identification and condemnation, justification and comparison; be aware of them and they will come to an end. Be silently aware of becoming; experience this silent awareness. Being still and becoming still are two different states. The becoming still can never experience the state of being still. It is only in being still that all conflict is transcended.

Questioner: Will you please talk about death? I do not mean the fear of death but rather the promise and hope which the thought of death must always hold for those who are aware throughout life that they do not belong.

Krishnamurti: Why are we concerned more with death than with living? Why do we look to death as a release, as a promise of hope? Why should there be more happiness, more joy in death, than in life? Why need we look to death as a renewal, rather than to life?

We want to escape from the pain of existence into a promise and hope that the unknown holds. Living is conflict and misery and as we educate ourselves to inevitable death, we look to death for reward. Death is glorified or shunned depending on the travail of life; life is a thing to be endured and death to be welcomed. Again we are caught in the conflict of the opposites. There is no truth in the opposites. We do not understand life, the present, so we look to the future, to death. Will tomorrow, the future, death, bring understanding? Will time open the door to Reality? We are ever concerned with time, the past weaving itself into the present and into the future, we are the product of time, the past; we escape into the future, into death.

The present is the Eternal. Through time the Timeless is not experienced. The now is ever existent; even if you escape into the future, the now is ever present. The present is the doorway to the past. If you do not understand the present now, will you understand it in the future? What you are now you will be, if the present is not understood. Understanding comes only through the present; *postponement does not yield comprehension. Time is transcended only in the stillness of the present.* This tranquillity is not to be gained through time, through becoming tranquil; there must be stillness, not the becoming still. We look to time as a means to become; this becoming is endless, it is not the Eternal, the Timeless. *The becoming is endless conflict, leading to illusion. In the stillness of the present is the Eternal.*

But thought-feeling is weaving back and forth, like a shuttle, between the past, the present and the future; it is ever rearranging its memories; ever maneuvering itself into a better position, more advantageous and comforting to itself. It is forever dissipating and formulating and how can such a mind be still, creatively empty? It is continually causing its own becoming by endless effort, and how can such a mind understand the still being of the present? Right thinking and meditation only can bring about the clarity of understanding and in this alone is there tranquillity.

The death of someone whom you love brings sorrow. The shock of that sorrow is benumbing, paralyzing, and as you come out of it you seek an escape from that sorrow. The lack of companionship, the habits that are revealed, the void and the loneliness that are uncovered through death cause pain, and you instinctively want to run away from it. You want comfort, a palliative to ease the suffering. Suffering is an indication of ignorance, but in seeking an escape from suffering you are only nourishing ignorance. Instead of blunting the mind-heart in sorrow through escapes, comforts, rationalizations, beliefs, be intensely aware of its cunning defense and comforting demands and then there will be the transformation of that emptiness and sorrow. Because you seek to escape sorrow pursues, because you seek comfort and dependence loneliness is intensified.

Not to escape, not to seek comfort, is extremely difficult and only intense self-awareness can eradicate the cause of sorrow.

In death we seek immortality; in the movement of birth and death we long for permanency; caught in the flux of time we crave for the Timeless; being in shadow we believe in light. Death does not lead to immortality; there is immortality only in life without death. In life we know death for we cling to life. We gather, we become; because we gather death comes, and knowing death we cling to life.

The hope and belief in immortality is not the experiencing of immortality. Belief and hope must cease for the immortal to be. You the believer, the maker of desire, must cease for the immortal to be. Your very belief and hope strengthen the self and you will know only birth and death. With the cessation of craving, the cause of conflict, there comes creative stillness and in this silence there is that which is birthless and deathless. Then life and death are one.

Questioner: It is easier to be free from sexual cravings than from subtle ambitions; for individuality wants self-expression with every breath. To be free from one's egotism means complete revolution in thinking. How can one remain in the world with such a reversal of mind?

Krishnamurti: Why do we want to remain in the world, the world that is so ruthless, ignorant and lustful? We may have to live in it but existence becomes painful only when we are of it. When we are ambitious, when there is enmity, when sensory values become all important, then we are lost and then the world holds us. Can we not live without greed among the greedy, content with little? Among the unhealthy can we not live in health? The world is not apart from us, we are the world; we have made it what it is. It has acquired its worldliness because of us and to leave it we must put away from us worldliness. Then only can we live with the world and not be of it.

Freedom from sex and ambition has no meaning without love. Chastity is not the product of the intellect; if the mind plans and plots to be chaste, it is no longer chaste. Love alone is chaste. Without love, the mere freedom from lust is barren and so the cause of endless strife and sorrow.

Once again the desire to be free from ambition is a conflict within the pattern of duality. If in this pattern you have trained yourself not to be ambitious you are still in the opposites, and so there is no freedom. You have only substituted one label for another and so conflict continues. Cannot we experience directly that state beyond the pattern of duality? Do not let us think in terms of becoming which indicate, do they not, the conflict of opposites? I am this and I want to become that only strengthens conflict and so

blunts the mind-heart. We are accustomed to think in terms of the future, to be or to become. Is it not possible to be aware of what is? When we think-feel what is, without comparison, without judgment, with that complete integration of the thinker with his thought, then that which is is utterly transformed; but this transformation can never take place within the field of duality. So let us be aware, not become aware, of ambition. When we are so aware we are conscious of all its implications; this feeling is important, not the mere intellectual analysis of the cause and effect of ambition. When you are aware of ambition you are conscious of its assertiveness, of its competitive ruthlessness, of its pleasures and pain; you are also conscious of its effect on society and relationship; of its social and business moralities which are immoral; of its cunning and hidden ways which ultimately lead to strife. Ambition breeds envy and ill-will, the power to dominate and to oppress. Be aware of yourself as you are and of the world which you have created, and without condemnation or justification be silently aware of your feeling ambitious.

If you are silently aware, as we explained, then the thinker and his thought are one, they are not separate but indivisible; then only is there complete transformation of ambition. But most of us, if we are aware at all, are conscious of the cause and effect of ambition and unfortunately we stop there; but if we looked more closely into this process of choice we would abandon it, for conflict is not productive of understanding. In abandoning it we would come upon the thinker and his thought. Just as the qualities cannot be separated from the self, so the thinker cannot be separated from his thought. When such integration takes place there is complete transformation of the thinker. This is an arduous task demanding alert pliability and choiceless awareness. Meditation comes from right thinking and right thinking from self-knowledge. Without self-knowledge there is no understanding.

Questioner: I understand you to say that creativeness is an intoxication from which it is hard to free oneself. Yet you often speak of the creative person. Who is he if he is not the artist, the poet, the builder?

Krishnamurti:¹ Is the artist, the poet, the builder necessarily the creative person? Is he not also lustful, worldly, seeking personal success? So is he not contributing to the chaos and misery in the world? Is he not responsible for its catastrophes and sorrows? He is responsible when he is seeking fame, is envious, when he is worldly; when his values are sensate; when he is passionate. Because he has a certain talent does that make the artist a creative person?

Creativeness is something infinitely greater than the mere capacity to express; mere successful expression and its recognition

surely does not constitute creativeness. Success in this world implies, does it not, being of this world, the world of oppression and cruelty, ignorance and ill-will? Ambition does produce results, but does it not bring with it misery and confusion for him who is successful and for his fellowman? The scientist, the builder, may have brought certain benefits but have they not brought also destruction and untold misery? Is this creativeness? Is it creativeness to set man against man as the politicians, the rulers, the priests are doing?

Creativeness comes into being when there is freedom from the bondage of craving with its conflict and sorrow. With the abandonment of the self with its assertiveness and ruthlessness and its endless struggles to become, there comes creative reality. In the beauty of a sunset or a still night, have you not felt intense, creative joy? At that moment, the self being temporarily absent, you are vulnerable, open to reality. This is a rare and unsought event, out of your control, but having once felt its intensity the self demands further enjoyment of it, and so conflict begins.

We all have experienced the temporary absence of the self and have felt at that moment the extraordinary creative ecstasy, but instead of its being rare and accidental is it not possible to bring about the right state in which Reality is eternal being? If you seek that ecstasy then it will be the activity of the self, which will produce certain results, but it will not be that state which comes through right thinking and right meditation. The subtle ways of the self must be known and understood for with self-knowledge comes right thinking and meditation.

Right thinking comes with the constant flow of self-awareness, awareness of worldly actions as well as of the activities in meditation. Creativeness with its ecstasy comes with the freedom from craving, which is virtue.

Questioner: During the last few years you seem to have concentrated in your talks, more and more, on the development of right thinking. Formerly you used to speak more about mystic experiences. Are you deliberately avoiding this aspect now?

Krishnamurti: Is it not necessary to lay right foundation for right experience? Without right thinking is not experience illusory? If you would have a well built and lasting house, must you not lay it on a firm and right foundation? To experience is comparatively easy and depending on our conditioning, we experience. We experience according to our beliefs and ideals but do all such experiences bring freedom? Have you not noticed that according to one's tradition and belief experience comes? Tradition and creed mould experience, but to experience Reality which is not of any tradition or ideology, must not thought go above and beyond its own con-

ditioning? Is not Reality ever the uncreated? And must not the mind cease to create, to formulate, if it would experience the Uncreated? Must not the mind-heart be utterly still and silent for the being of the Real?

As any experience can be misinterpreted so any experience can be made to appear as the Real. On the interpreter depends the translation and if the translator is biased, ignorant, moulded in a pattern of thought, then his understanding will conform to his conditioning. If he is so-called religious, his experiences will be according to his tradition and belief; if he is non-religious then his experiences will shape themselves according to his background. On the instrument depends its capacity; *the mind-heart must make itself capable. It is capable of either experiencing the Real or creating for itself illusion.* To experience the Real is arduous for it demands infinite pliability and deep, basic stillness. This pliability, this stillness is not the result of desire or of an act of will, for desire and will are the outcome of craving, the dual drive to be and not to be. Pliability and tranquillity are not the outcome of conflict; they come into being with understanding and understanding comes with self-knowledge.

Without self-knowledge you merely live in a state of contradiction and uncertainty; without self-knowledge what you think-feel has no basis; without self-knowledge enlightenment is not possible. You are the world, the neighbor, the friend, the so-called enemy. If you would understand you must first understand yourself, for in you is the root of all understanding. In you is the beginning and the end. *To understand this vast complex entity mind-heart must be simple.*

To understand the past, mind-heart must be aware of its activities in the present *for through the present alone the past may be understood*, but you will not understand the present if there is self-identification.

So through the present the past is revealed; through the immediate consciousness the many hidden layers are discovered and understood. Thus through constant awareness there comes deep and wide self-knowledge.

IV

Can each one who is responsible for the conflict and misery in himself and so in the world allow his mind-heart to be dulled by erroneous philosophies and ideas? If you who have created this struggle and suffering do not change fundamentally, will systems, conferences, blue prints bring about order and good will? Is it not imperative that you transform yourself, for, what you are the world is? Your inward conflicts express themselves in outward disasters. Your problem is the world's problem and you alone can solve it, not another; you cannot leave it to others. The politician, the economist, the reformer, is like yourself an opportunist, a cunning deviser of plans; but our problem, this human conflict and misery, this empty existence which produces such agonizing disasters, needs more than cunning device, more than superficial reforms of the politician and the propagandist. It needs a radical change of the human mind and no one can bring about this transformation save yourself. For what you are your group, your society, your leader is. Without you the world is not; in you is the beginning and end of all things. No group, no leader can establish eternal value save yourself.

Catastrophes and misery come when temporary sensate values dominate over eternal value. The permanent, eternal value is not the result of belief; your belief in God does not mean that you are experiencing eternal value, the way of your life alone will show its reality. Oppression and exploitation, aggressiveness and economic ruthlessness inevitably follow when we have lost Reality. You have lost it when professing the love of God you condone and justify the murdering of your fellowman, when you justify mass murder in the name of peace and freedom. As long as you give supreme importance to sensory values there will be conflict, confusion and sorrow. Killing another can never be justified and we lose man's immense significance when sensate values remain predominant.

We will have misery and tribulation so long as religion is organized to be part of the State, the hand-maiden of the State. It helps to ~~condone~~ organized force as policy of the State; and ~~an~~ encourages oppression, ignorance and intolerance. How then can religion allied with the State fulfill its only true function, that of revealing and maintaining eternal value? When Reality is lost and not sought after there is disunity and man will be against man. Confusion and misery cannot be banished by the forgetful process of time, by the comforting idea of evolution which only engenders slothfulness, smug acceptance and the continuous drift towards catastrophe; we must not let the course of our lives be directed by others, for

others, or for the sake of the future. We are responsible for our life, not another; we are responsible for our conduct, not another; not another can transform us. Each one must discover and experience Reality and in that alone is there joy, serenity and highest wisdom.

How then can we come to this experience, through the change of outward circumstances or through transformation from within? Outer change implies the control of environment through legislation, through economic and social reform, through knowledge of facts and through fluctuating improvement, either violent or gradual. But does modification of the outer circumstances ever bring about fundamental inner transformation? Is not inner transformation first necessary to bring about an outward result? You may, through legislation, forbid ambition as ambition breeds ruthlessness, self-assertiveness, competition and conflict, but can ambition be rooted out from without? Will it not, suppressed in one way, assert itself in another? Does not the inner motive, private thought-feeling always determine the outer? To bring about an outward peaceful transformation should there not take place first a deep psychological change? Can the outer, however pleasant, bring about lasting contentment? The inner craving ever modifies the outer. Psychologically what you are your society, you State, your religion is; if you are lustful, envious, ignorant, then your environment is what you are. We create the world in which we live. To bring about a radical and peaceful change there must be voluntary and intelligent inner transformation; this psychological change is surely not to be brought about through compulsion and if it is, then there will be such inner conflict and confusion as will again precipitate society into disaster. The inner regeneration must be voluntary, intelligent, not compelled. We must first seek Reality and then only can there be peace and order about us.

When you approach the problem of existence from without there is at once the dual process set going; in duality there is endless conflict and such conflict only dulls the mind-heart. When you approach the problem of existence from within there is no division between the inner and the outer; the division ceases because the inner is the outer, *the thinker and his thoughts are one, inseparable*. But we falsely separate the thought from the thinker and so try to deal only with the part, to educate and modify the part, thereby hoping to transform the whole. The part ever becomes more and more divided and thus there is more and more conflict. So we must be concerned with the thinker from within and not with the modification of the part, his thought.

But unfortunately most of us are caught between the uncertainty of the outer and the uncertainty of the inner. It is this uncertainty that must be understood. It is the uncertainty of value that brings about conflict, confusion and sorrow and prevents our following a clear

course of action either of the outer or of the inner. If we followed the outer with full awareness, perceiving its full significance, then such a course would inevitably lead to the inner, but unfortunately we get lost in the outer for we are not sufficiently pliable in our self-inquiry. As you examine sensory values by which our thoughts-feelings are dominated, and become aware of them without choice, you will perceive that the inner becomes clear. This discovery will bring freedom and creative joy. But this discovery and its experience cannot be made for you by another. Will your hunger be satisfied through watching another eat? Through your own self-awareness you must awaken to false values and so discover eternal value. There can be fundamental change within and without only when thought-feeling disentangles itself from those sensate values that cause conflict and sorrow.

Questioner: In truly great works of art, poetry, music there is expressed and conveyed something indescribable which seems to mirror Reality or Truth or God. Yet it is a fact that in their private lives most of those who created such works have never succeeded in extricating themselves from the vicious circle of conflict. How can it be explained that an individual who has not liberated himself is able to create something in which the conflict of the opposites is transcended? Or to put the question in reverse, don't you have to conclude that creativeness is born out of conflict?

Krishnamurti: Is conflict necessary for creativeness? What do we mean by conflict? We crave to be, positively or negatively. This constant craving breeds conflict. We consider this conflict inevitable, almost virtuous; we consider it essential for human growth.

What happens when you are in conflict? Through conflict mind-heart is made weary, dull, insensitive. Conflict strengthens self-protective capacities, conflict is the substance on which the self thrives. In its very nature the self is the cause of all conflict, and where the self is, creation is not.

Is conflict necessary for creative being? When do you feel that creative overpowering ecstasy? Only when all conflict has ceased, only when the self is absent, only when there is complete tranquillity. This stillness cannot take place when the mind-heart is agitated, when it is in conflict; this only strengthens the self-enclosing process. As most of us are in a state of constant struggle within ourselves, we rarely have such moments of high sensibility or stillness, and when they do occur they are accidental. So we try to recapture those accidental moments, and only further burden our mind-heart with the dead past.

Does not the poet, the artist, go through the same process that we do? Perhaps he may be more sensitive, more alert and so more

vulnerable, open, but surely he, too, experiences creation in moments of self-abnegation, self-forgetfulness, in moments of complete stillness. This experience he tries to express in marble or in music; but does not conflict come into being in expressing the experience, in perfecting the word, and not at the moment of experience itself? Creation can only take place when the mind-heart is still, and not caught in the net of becoming. The open passivity to Reality is not the result of craving with its will and conflict.

Like us the artist has moments of stillness in which creation is experienced; then he puts it down in paint, in music, in form. His expression assumes great value for he has painted it, it is *his* work. Ambition, fame become important and in an endless, stupid struggle he is caught. He thus contributes to the world's misery, envy and bloodshed, passion and ill-will. He gets lost in this struggle and the more he is lost the further recedes his sensibility, his vulnerability to truth. His worldly conflicts dim the joyous clarity even though his technical capacity helps him to carry on with his empty and hardening visions.

But we are not great artists, musicians or poets; we have no special gifts or talents; we have no release through marble, painting or through the garland of words. We are in conflict and sorrow but we, too, have occasional moments of the immensity of Truth. Then momentarily we forget ourselves but soon we are back into our daily turmoil, blunting and hardening our mind-heart. The mind-heart is never still; if it is, it is the silence of weariness, but such a state is not the silence of understanding, of wisdom. This creative, expectant emptiness is not brought about by will or by desire; it comes into being when conflict of the self ceases.

Conflict ceases only when there is complete revolution in value, not mere substitution. Through self-awareness alone can the mind-heart free itself from all values; this transcending of all values is not easy, it comes not with practice but with the deepening of awareness. It is not a gift, a talent of the few, but all who are strenuous and eager can experience creative Reality.

Questioner: The present is an unmitigated tragic horror. Why do you insist that in the present is the Eternal?

Krishnamurti: The present is conflict and sorrow, with an occasional flash of passing joy. The present weaves back and forth into the past and into the future, and so the present is restless. The present is the result of the past, our being is founded upon it. How can you understand the past save through its result, the present? You cannot dig into the past by any other instrument than the one you have, which is the present. The present is the doorway to the past and if you wish, to the future. What you are is the result of the past, of yesterday, and to understand yesterday you must begin

with today. To understand yourself, you must begin with yourself as you are today.

Without comprehending the present which is rooted in the past, you will have no understanding. The present misery of man is understood when through the door of the present he is able to be aware of the causes that have produced it. You cannot brush aside the present in trying to understand the past but only through awareness of the present does the past begin to unfold itself. The present is tragic and bloody; surely not by denying it, not by justifying it will we understand it. We have to face it as it is and uncover the causes that have brought about the present. How you regard the present, how your mind is conditioned to it, will reveal the process of the past; if you are prejudiced, nationalistic, if you hate, what you are now will pervert your understanding of the past; your passion, ill-will and ignorance, what you are now, will corrupt your understanding of the causes that have led to the present. In understanding yourself, as you are now, the roll of the past unfolds itself.

The present is of the highest importance; the present, however tragic and painful, is the only door to Reality. The future is the continuance of the past through the present; through understanding the present is the future transformed. The present is the only time for understanding for it extends into yesterday and into tomorrow. The present is the whole of time; in the seed of the present is the past and the future; the past is the present and the future is the present. The present is the Eternal, the Timeless. But we regard the present, the now, as a passage to the past or to the future; in the process of becoming, the present is a means to an end and thereby loses its immense significance. The becoming creates continuity, everlastingness, but it is not the Timeless, the Eternal. Craving to become weaves the pattern of time. Have you not experienced in moments of great ecstasy the cessation of time; there is no past, no future but an intense awareness, a timeless present? Having experienced such a state greed begins its activities and recreates time, recalling, reviving, looking to the future for further experience, rearranging the pattern of time to capture the Timeless. Thus greed, the becoming, holds thought-feeling in the bondage of time.

So be aware of the present, however sorrowful or pleasant; then it will unfold itself as a time process and if thought-feeling can follow its subtle and devious ways and transcend them, then that very extensional awareness is the timeless present. Look only to the present, neither to the past nor to the future, for love is the present, the Timeless.

Questioner: You decry war and yet are you not supporting it?

Krishnamurti: Are we not all of us maintaining this terrible

mass murder? We are responsible, each one, for war; war is an end result of our daily life; it is brought into being through our daily thought-feeling-action. What we are in our occupational, social, religious relationships, that we project; what we are, the world is.

Unless we understand the primary and secondary issues involved in the responsibility for war, we shall be confused and unable to extricate ourselves from its disaster. We must know where to lay the emphasis and then only shall we understand the problem. The inevitable end of this society is war; it is geared to war, its industrialization leads to war; its values promote war. Whatever we do within its borders contributes to war. When we buy something, the tax goes towards war; the postage stamps help to support war. We cannot escape from war go where we will, especially now, as society is organized for total war. The most simple and harmless work contributes to war in one way or another. Whether we like it or not, by our very existence we are helping to maintain war. So what are we to do? We cannot withdraw to an island or to a primitive community, for the present culture is everywhere. So what can we do? Shall we refuse to support war by not paying taxes, not buying stamps? Is that the primary issue? If it is not, and if it is only the secondary, then do not let us be distracted by it.

Is not the primary issue much deeper, that of the cause of war itself? If we can understand the cause of war then the secondary issue can be approached from a different point of view altogether; if we do not understand, then we shall be lost in it. If we can free ourselves from the causes of war then perhaps the secondary problem may not arise at all.

So emphasis must be laid upon the discovery within oneself of the cause of war; this discovery must be made by each one and not by an organized group, for group activities tend to make for thoughtlessness, mere propaganda and slogan, which only breed further intolerance and strife. The cause must be self-discovered and thus each one through direct experience liberates himself from it.

If we consider deeply we are well aware of the causes of war: passion, ill-will and ignorance; sensuality, worldliness and the craving for personal fame and continuity; greed, envy and ambition; nationalism with its separate sovereignties, economic frontiers, social divisions, racial prejudices and organized religion. Cannot each one be aware of his greed, ill-will, ignorance, and so free himself from them? We hold to nationalism for it is an outlet to our cruel, criminal instincts; in the name of our country or ideology we can murder or liquidate with impunity, become heroes, and the more we kill our fellowmen the more honor we receive from our country.

Now is not liberation from the cause of conflict and sorrow the primary issue? If we do not lay emphasis upon this how will the solution of the secondary problems stop war? If we do not root out the causes of war in ourselves, of what value is it to tinker with the

outward results of our inner state? We must, each one, dig deeply and clear away lust, ill-will and ignorance; we must utterly abandon nationalism, racialism and those causes that breed enmity. We must concern ourselves wholly with that which is of primary importance and not be confused with secondary issues.

Questioner: You are very depressing. I seek inspiration to carry on; you do not cheer us with words of courage and hope. Is it wrong to seek inspiration?

Krishnamurti: Why do you want to be inspired? Is it not because in yourself you are empty, uncreative, lonely? You want to fill this loneliness, this aching void; you must have tried different ways of filling it and you hope to escape from it again by coming here. This process of covering up the arid loneliness is called inspiration. Inspiration then becomes a mere stimulation and as with all stimulation it soon brings its own boredom and insensitivity. So we go from one inspiration, stimulation, to another, each bringing its own disappointment and weariness; thus the mind-heart loses its pliability, its sensitivity; the inner capacity of tension is lost through this constant process of stretching and relaxing. Tension is necessary to discover but a tension that demands relaxation or a stimulation soon loses its capacity to renew itself, to be pliable, to be alert. This alert pliability cannot be induced from the outside; it comes when it is not dependent upon stimulation, upon inspiration.

Is not all stimulation similar in effect? Whether you take a drink or are stimulated by a picture or an idea, whether you go to a concert or to a religious ceremony, or work yourself up over an act however noble or ignoble, does not all this blunt the mind-heart? A righteous anger, which is an absurdity, however stimulating and inspiring it may be, makes for insensitivity; and is not the highest form of intelligence, sensitivity, receptivity, necessary to experience Reality? Stimulation breeds dependence and dependence whether worthy or unworthy causes fear. It is relatively unimportant how one is stimulated or inspired, whether through organized church or politics or through distraction for the result will be the same—insensitivity caused through fear and dependence.

Distractions become stimulations. Our society primarily encourages distraction, distraction in every form. Our thinking-feeling itself has become a process of wandering away from the center, from Reality. So it is extremely difficult to withdraw from all distractions for we have become almost incapable of being choicelessly aware of what is. So conflict arises which further distracts our thought-feeling, and it is only through constant awareness that thought-feeling is able to extricate itself from the net of distractions.

Besides, who can give you cheer, courage and hope? If we rely

on another, however great and noble, we are utterly lost for dependence breeds possessiveness in which there is endless struggle and pain. Cheer and happiness are not ends in themselves; they are, as courage and hope, incidents in the search of something that is an end in itself. It is this end that must be sought after patiently and diligently, and only through its discovery will our turmoil and pain cease. The journey towards its discovery lies through oneself; every other journey is a distraction leading to ignorance and illusion. The journey within oneself must be undertaken not for a result, not to solve conflict and sorrow; for the search itself is devotion, inspiration. Then the journeying itself is a revealing process, an experience which is constantly liberating and creative. Have you not noticed that inspiration comes when you are not seeking it? It comes when all expectation has ceased, when the mind-heart is still. What is sought after is self-created and so is not the Real.

Questioner: You say that life and death are one and the same thing. Please elaborate this startling statement.

Krishnamurti: We know birth and death, existence and non-existence; we are aware of this conflict between the opposites, the desire to live, to continue, and the fear of death, of non-continuance. Our life is held in the pattern of becoming and non-becoming. We may have theories, beliefs and accordingly experience, but they are still within the field of duality, of birth and death.

We think-feel in terms of time, of living, of becoming, or of not becoming, or of death, or of extending this becoming beyond death. The pattern of our thought-feeling moves from the known to the known, from the past to the present, to the future; if there is fear of the future, it clings to the past or to the present. We are held in time and how can we, who think-feel in terms of time, experience the reality of Timelessness, in which life and death are one!

Have you not experienced in moments of great intensity the cessation of time? Such a cessation is generally forced upon one; it is accidental but depending upon our pleasure in it we desire to repeat the experience again. So we become once more prisoners of time. Is it not possible for the mind-heart to stop formulating, to be utterly still and not forced into stillness by an act of will? Will and determination are still self-continuation and so within the field of time. Does not the determination to be, the will to become, imply self-growth, time, which makes for the fear of death?

As the stump of a dead tree in the middle of a stream gathers the floating wreckage so we gather, we cling to our accumulation; thus we and the deathless stream of life are separate. We sit on the dead stump of our accumulation and consider life and death; we do not let go the ever accumulating process and be of the living waters. To be free from accumulation there must be deep self-knowledge, not

the superficial knowledge of the few layers of our consciousness. The discovery and the experience of all the layers of consciousness is the beginning of true meditation. In the tranquillity of mind-heart is wisdom and Reality.

Reality is to be experienced, not speculated upon. This experience can only be when the mind-heart ceases to accumulate. Mind-heart does not cease to accumulate through denial or through determination, but only through self-awareness; through self-knowledge the cause of accumulation is discovered. It is experienced only when the conflict of the opposites ceases. Only right thinking, which comes with self-knowledge and right meditation, can bring about the unity of life and death. It is only by dying each day that there can be eternal renewal.

It is difficult to so die if you are in the process of becoming, if you are gathering, sitting on the stump of dead accumulation. You must abandon it, plunge into the ever living waters; you must die each day to the day's gathering, die both to the pleasant and the unpleasant. We cling to the pleasant and let the unpleasant go; so we strengthen in gratification and know death. Without seeking reward, let us abandon our gatherings and then only can there be the immortal. Then life is not opposed to death nor is death a darkening of life.

V

This morning I am going to answer questions only. These answers and talks will be of little significance if they remain merely on the verbal level. Most of us seek stimulation and find it in various ways but it soon wears out. Only experience keeps the mind-heart pliable and alert but experience is beyond and above intellectual and emotional gratification and stimulation. Feeling makes reason pliable and it is this pliability of reason with the vulnerability of feeling that brings experience. It is experience, when rightly understood, that transforms.

At all times, and especially now, there is need for transformation through vital experience; this transformation is essential in a world that has become utterly ruthless, a world whose values are predominantly sensate, a world that is corrupt in its own degradation. Without deeply and widely experiencing eternal value we shall not

find any solution to our problems; any answer other than that of the Real will only increase our burden and sorrow. To so experience each one must stand alone, not dependent on any authority, on any organization, religious or secular, for dependence of any kind creates uncertainty and fear thus preventing the experiencing of the Real. In the outer world there is no hope, no clarity, no creative and renewing understanding, there is only bloodshed and confusion and mounting disaster. Only within is there understanding and this understanding is to be discovered, not through example, not through authority. Through self-awareness and self-knowledge only can come tranquillity and wisdom. There is no tranquillity if you are following another; there is no peace if you are worldly; there is no understanding if there is self-ignorance. Through silent awareness of the outer and in being objectively aware of the events of life you are inevitably forced to be aware of the inner, the subjective; in comprehending the self the outer becomes clear and significant. The outer has no significance in itself; it has significance only in relation to the inner. To experience and understand the inner you must be prepared to be alone; you must withstand the persuasive weight of the outer, its logical and cunning deceptions.

Questioner: You said last Sunday that each one of us is responsible for these terrible wars. Are we also responsible for the abominable tortures in the concentration camps and for the deliberate extermination of a people in Central Europe?

Krishnamurti: Is it not very evident that each one of us is responsible for war? Wars do not come into being out of unknown causes, they have definite sources and those who wish to extricate themselves from this periodical madness called war must search out these causes and free themselves. War is one of the greatest calamities that could happen to man who is capable of experiencing the Real. He must be concerned with eliminating the cause of war within himself, not with who is less or more degraded and terrible in war. We must not be carried away with secondary issues but be aware of the primary issue which is organized killing itself. The secondary issues may cause fear and the desire for vengeance, but without understanding the essential reasons for war conflict and sorrow will not cease.

To kill another is the greatest crime for man is capable of realizing the Highest. War, the deliberate organization of murder, is the greatest catastrophe that man can bring upon himself for with it comes untold misery and destruction, degradation and corruption; when once you admit such a vast "evil" as the organized murder of others, then you open the door to a host of minor disasters. Each one of us is responsible for war for each one has brought about the

present condition, consciously or unconsciously by his attitude towards life, by the false values he has given to existence. Having lost the eternal value the passing sensory values become all important. There is no end to ever expanding desire. Things are necessary but have no eternal value and the mad desire for possessions ever leads to strife and misery.

When acquisitiveness in every form is encouraged, when nationalism and separate sovereign states exist, when religion separates, when there is intolerance and ignorance then killing your fellowman is inevitable. War is the result of our every day life. Passion, ill-will and oppression are justified when they are national; to kill for the State, for the country, for an ideology, is considered necessary, noble. Each one indulges in this degrading ruthlessness for there is in each one the desire to do harm. War becomes a means of releasing one's own brutal instincts and encourages irresponsibility. Such a state is only possible when sensate values predominate.

As each one is responsible for the shaping of this culture, if each one does not radically transform himself then how can there be an end to this brutal world and its ways? Each one is responsible for these tragedies and disasters, for tortures and bestialities, if he thinks-feels in terms of nations, groups, or thinks of himself as Hindu or Buddhist, Christian or Moslem. If a so-called "foreigner" in India is killed by a nationalist, then I am responsible for that murder if I am a nationalist; but I am *not* responsible if I do not think-feel in terms of nations, groups or classes, if I am not lustful, if I have no ill-will, if I am not worldly. Then only is there freedom from responsibility for killing, torturing, oppressing.

We have lost the feeling of humanity; we feel responsible only to the class or group to which we belong; we feel responsible to a name, to a label. We have lost compassion, the love of the whole, and without this quickening flame of life we look to politicians, to priests, to some economic planning for peace and happiness. In these there is no hope. In each one alone is there creative understanding, that compassion which is necessary for the well-being of man. Right means create right ends, wrong means will bring only emptiness and death, not peace and joy.

Questioner: I feel I cannot reach the other shore without help, without the Grace of God. If I can say Thy Will be Done and dissolve myself in it, do I not dissolve my limitations? If I can relinquish myself unconditionally is there not Grace to help me bridge the gulf which separates God and me?

Krishnamurti: This abandonment of the self is not an act of will; this crossing over to the other shore is not an activity of purpose or of gain. Reality comes in the fullness of silence and wisdom.

You may not invite Reality, it must come to you; you may not choose Reality, it must choose you.

We must understand effort, unconditional stillness, self-abandonment; for through right awareness alone comes meditative tranquillity.

What is right effort? There is an understanding of right effort when there is an awareness of the process of becoming. Just as long as effort is made to become, so long will duality exist, the thinker separating himself from his thought. This conflict of opposites is considered inevitable and necessary for freedom and growth. When one who is greedy makes an effort to become non-greedy, this effort we consider righteous and spiritual. But is it right effort? Is effort spent in overcoming the opposite productive of understanding? Is one not still greedy in trying to become non-greedy? He may take on a new, gratifying verbal garb, but the maker of the effort is still the same, he is still greedy. The effort made to become, not only creates the conflict of opposites but also is directed along wrong channels, for, to become is still to be in conflict and sorrow; so there is no freedom for experiencing Truth in the long corridor of opposites.

Our effort is spent in denying or accepting and thus thought-feeling is made blunt in this endless conflict. This surely is wrong effort for it is not productive of creative understanding. Right endeavor consists in being choicelessly aware of this conflict, in being silently observant without identification. It is this silent, choiceless awareness of conflict that brings freedom. In this passive awareness that is tranquil, Reality comes into being.

Be aware of your conflict, of how you deny, justify, compare or identify; of how you try to become; be aware of the deep, full significance of the pain of the opposites. Then will come the experience of the inseparability of the thinker and his thought, the stillness of understanding through which alone there can be radical transformation, the crossing over to the other shore without the action of will.

There is a vast difference between becoming still and being still. We must die each day to all experiences and accumulations, fears and hopes, and we can only do this by actively being aware of our conflicts, and then being passively still. We must live each day the four seasons, the spring, summer, autumn and winter of passivity. As in winter the fields lie fallow, open to the heavens, to revitalize themselves, so the mind-heart must allow itself to be open, creatively empty. Then only can there be the breath of Reality.

This creative emptiness, this ardent passivity, is not brought about through an act of will. It is extremely difficult for those who are slaves to distraction, who are incessantly active, who are ever striving to become, to be alertly passive. If you would understand, the mind-heart must be still; there must be heightened sensitivity to receive and there can be tranquillity only in understanding. This

silent awareness is not an act of determination but it comes into being when thought-feeling is not caught in the net of becoming. You never say to a child become still, but be still. We say to ourselves we will become and for this becoming we have various excuses and interminable reasons and so we are never still. The becoming still can never be the being still; only with the death of becoming is there being.

In moments of great creativity, in moments of great beauty, there is utter tranquillity; in these moments there is complete absence of the self with all its conflicts; it is this negation, the highest form of thinking-feeling, that is essential for creative being. But these moments are rare with most of us, the moments when the thinker and his thought are transcended; these occasions happen unexpectedly, but the self soon returns. Having once experienced this living stillness thought-feeling clings to its memory thus preventing the further experience of Reality. This cultivation of memory is effort directed along wrong channels, resulting in the strengthening of the self with its conflict and pain; but if we are deeply aware of our problems and conflicts and understand them, then this very cultivation of self-knowledge brings about alert passivity and tranquillity. In this living silence is Reality. Only in utter simplicity, when all craving has ceased, is the bliss of Reality.

Questioner: I am an inventor and I happen to have invented several things which have been used in this war. I think I am opposed to killing but what am I to do with my capacity? I cannot suppress it as the power to invent drives me on.

Krishnamurti: Which do you think-feel is the more urgently important problem to understand, the power to kill or the capacity to invent? If you are concerned only with inventing, with the mere expression of your talent, then you must find out why you give so much emphasis to it. Does not your capacity give you a means of escape from life, from reality? Then is not your talent a barrier to relationship? To be is to be related and nothing can exist in isolation. So without self-knowledge your capacity to invent becomes dangerous to your neighbor and to yourself.

Does your occupation aid in destroying your fellowman? Your inventions and activities may temporarily help but if they lead him to ultimate destruction then of what use are they? If the end result of this culture is mass murder then of what significance is your talent? What is the purpose of inventing, improving, rearranging if it all leads to the destruction of man? If you are only interested in fulfilling your particular capacity, disregarding the wider issues of life and the ultimate end of existence, then your talent is meaningless and worthless. Only in relation to the ultimate Reality is your capacity significant.

I feel that all of you are not vitally interested in this question. Is this not also your problem? You may be an artist, a carpenter or have some other occupation and this question is as vital to you as to the inventor. *If you are an artist or a doctor your occupation or the expression of your talent must have its foundation in reality, otherwise it becomes merely a form of self-expression and mere expression of the self leads inevitably to sorrow. If you are interested only in self-expression then you are contributing to the conflict, confusion and antagonism of man. Without first searching out the meaning of life mere self-expression, however gratifying, will only bring misery and disaster.*

Beware of mere talent. With self-knowledge the craving for self-fulfillment is transformed. The craving for fulfillment brings its own frustration and disillusionment, for the desire for self-fulfillment arises from ignorance.

Questioner: Can I find God in a fox-hole?

Krishnamurti: *A man who is seeking God will not be in a fox-hole. How false are the ways of our thinking! We create a false situation and in that hope to find truth; in the false we try to find the real. Happy is he who sees the false as the false and that which is true as true.*

We have become perverted in the ways of our thinking-feeling. In sorrow we wish to find happiness; only in abandoning the cause of sorrow is there joy. You and the soldier have created a culture which forces you to murder and to be murdered, and in the midst of this cruelty you desire to find love. If you are seeking God you will not be in a fox-hole but if you are there and seek Him you will know how to act. We justify murder and in the very act of murdering we try to find love. We create a society essentially based on sensate value, on worldliness, which necessitates the fox-hole. We justify and condone the fox-hole and then, in the fox-hole or in the bomber, we hope to find God, love. Without fundamentally altering the structure of our thought-feeling, the Real is not to be found. Being envious, greedy and ignorant we want to be peaceful, tolerant and wise; with one hand we murder and with the other we pacify. It is this contradiction that must be understood; you cannot have both greed and peace, the fox-hole and God; you cannot justify ignorance and yet hope for enlightenment.

The very nature of the self is to be in contradiction; and only when thought-feeling frees itself from its own opposing desires can there be tranquillity and joy. This freedom with its joy comes with deep awareness of the conflict of craving. When you become aware of the dual process of desire and are passively alert there is the joy of the Real, joy which is not the product of will or of time.

You cannot escape from ignorance at any time, it must be dis-

pelled through your own awakening; none can awaken you save yourself. Through your own self-awareness does the problem of your making cease to be.

Questioner: What is a lasting way to solve a psychological problem?

Krishnamurti: There are three stages of awareness, are there not, in any human problem? First, being aware of the cause and effect of the problem; second, being aware of its dual or contradictory process; and third, being aware of self and experiencing the thinker and his thought as one.

Take any problem that you have: for example, anger. Be aware of its cause, physiological and psychological. Anger may arise from nervous tiredness and tension; it may arise from certain conditioning of thought-feeling, from fear, from dependence or from craving for security, and so on; it may arise through bodily and emotional pain. Many of us are aware of the conflict of the opposites; but because of pain or disturbance due to conflict, we instinctively seek to be rid of it violently or in varieties of subtle ways; we are concerned with escaping from the struggle rather than with understanding it. It is this desire to be rid of the conflict that gives strength to its continuity, and so maintains contradiction; it is this desire that must be watched and understood. Yet it is difficult to be alertly passive in the conflict of duality; we condemn or justify, compare or identify; so we are ever choosing sides and thus maintaining the cause of conflict. To be choicelessly aware of the conflict of duality is arduous but it is essential if you would transcend the problem.

The modification of the outer, of the thought, is a self-protective device of the thinker; he sets his thought in a new frame which safeguards him from radical transformation. It is one of the many cunning ways of the self. Because the thinker sets himself apart from his thought, problems and conflicts continue, and the constant modification of his thought alone, without radically transforming himself merely continues illusion.

The complete integration of the thinker with his thought cannot be experienced if there is no understanding of the process of becoming and the conflict of opposites. This conflict cannot be transcended through an act of will, it can only be transcended when choice has ceased. No problem can be solved on its own plane; it can be resolved lastingly only when the thinker has ceased to become.

This morning I shall answer as many questions as possible.

Questioner: If we had not destroyed the evil that was in Central Europe it would have conquered us. Do you mean to say that we should not have defended ourselves? Aggression must be met. How would you meet it?

Krishnamurti: This wave of aggression, of blood, of organized criminality, seems to arise periodically in one group and pass over to another. This is recurrent in history. No country is free from this aggression. We are all, each in his way, responsible for this wave of mass aggression and destruction.

Is it possible to live without aggression and so without defense? Is all effort a series of attacks and defenses? Can life be lived without this destructive effort? Each one should be aware of his responses to this problem. Does not all effort to become necessitate the self-assertiveness and self-expansion of the individual and so of the group or nation, and lead to conflict, antagonism and war?

Is it possible to solve this problem of aggression along the lines of defense? Defense implies self-protection, opposition and conflict, and is antagonism to be dissolved by opposition? Is it possible to live in this world and yet be free from this constant battle between yours and mine, with its ruthless attack and defense? Because we desire to protect our name, our property, our nationality, our religion, our ideals, we cultivate the spirit of attack and defense. We are possessive, acquisitive and so we have created a social structure which necessitates progressively ruthless exploitation and aggression. This acquisitive becoming breeds its own opposition and so defense and attack become part of our daily existence. No solution can be found as long as we are thinking-feeling in terms of defense and attack, which only maintain confusion and strife.

Is it possible to think-feel without defense and attack? It is possible only when there is love, when each one abandons greed, ill-will and ignorance which express themselves through nationalism, craving for power and other forms of criminality and cruelty. If one wishes to solve this problem permanently surely thought-feeling must free itself from all acquisitiveness and fear. This attitude of attack and defense is cultivated in our daily life and ends ultimately in war and other catastrophes. The difficulty lies in our own contradictory nature; we want peace and yet we cultivate those causes that bring about war and destruction. We want happiness and freedom and yet we indulge in lust, ill-will and thoughtlessness; we

pray for understanding and yet deny it in our daily life; we want to enjoy both opposites and so we are confused and lost.

If you want to put an end to this wave of ruthlessness, of appalling destruction and misery, if you wish to save your son, your husband, your neighbor, you must pay the price. This misery is not the creation of one group or race but of each one of us; each one must thoughtfully abandon the causes that produce these calamities and untold misery. You must completely set aside your nationalism, your greed and ill-will, your craving for power and wealth and your adherence to organized religious prejudices which, while asserting the unity of man, set man against man. Only then will there be peace and joy.

Why is it that we seem to be incapable of living creatively and happily without destroying each other? Is it not because we so condition ourselves through our own passion, ill-will and stupidity that we are incapable of living joyously and serenely? We must break through our own conditioning and be as nothing. We are afraid of being nothing so we escape and thus feed our fear with greed, hate, ambition.

The problem is not how to defend but how to transcend the desire for self-expansion, the craving to become. Only those individuals who abandon their passions, their craving for fame and personal immortality, can help to bring about creative peace and joy.

Questioner: In one's growth is there not a continuous and recurring process of the death of one's cherished hopes and desires; of cruel disillusionment in regard to the past; of transmutation of those negative phenomena into a more positive and vitalizing life—until the same stage is reached again on a higher spiral? Are not conflict and pain therefore indispensable to all growth and at all stages?

Krishnamurti: Are conflict and pain necessary for creative being? Is sorrow necessary for understanding? Is not conflict inevitable in becoming, in self-expanding? Is not the creative state of being the freedom from conflict, from accumulated existence? Does accumulation at any stage on the spiral of becoming bring about the creative being? There is becoming and growth along the horizontal path of existence, but does it lead to the Timeless? It is to be experienced only when the horizontal is abandoned. Is the experience of being, related to the conflict of the horizontal, the conflict of becoming? Through time the Timeless cannot be realized.

What happens when we are in conflict? In the struggle to overcome conflict we become disillusioned, we enter into darkness or, being in conflict, we try to find escapes in various forms. If thought-feeling is caught neither in disillusionment nor in comforting refuge

then conflict will find the means of its own ending. Conflict produces disillusionment or the desire to escape, for we are unwilling to think-out, feel-out all the implications involved in it; we are lazy, too conditioned to change, accepting authority and the easy way of life. To understand conflict and to be able to examine it with freedom, there must be a certain disinterested tranquillity. But when we are in conflict or in sorrow our instinctive response is to escape from it, to run away from its cause, not to face its hidden significance; so we seek various channels of escape: activity, amusement, gods, war. So distractions multiply; they become more important than the cause of sorrow itself; we then become intolerant of the means of escape of others and try to modify or reform them, but conflict and sorrow continue.

Now is conflict necessary for understanding? Is understanding the result of growth? Do we not mean by growth the constant becoming of the self, accumulating and renouncing, being greedy and becoming non-greedy, the endless process of becoming? The very nature of the self is to create contradiction. Is conflict between the opposites growth bringing with it understanding? Does the struggle in the endless corridor of the opposites lead anywhere except to further conflict and sorrow?

There is no end to conflict and sorrow in becoming. This becoming leads to the conflict of contradiction in which most of us are caught; being caught in it, we think struggle and pain are inevitable, a necessary and evolutionary process. So time becomes an indispensable factor for growth, for further becoming. In this spiral of becoming there is no end to strife and pain. So our problem is how to put an end to them. Thought-feeling must go beyond and above the pattern of duality; that is, when there is conflict and pain, live with it unconditionally without escaping; to escape is to compare, to justify, to condemn; to be aware of sorrow is not to seek a refuge, an alleviation, but to be aware of the ways of thought-feeling. So when there is understanding of the futility of refuge, of escape, then that very sorrow creates the necessary flame that will consume it. Tranquillity of understanding is needed to transcend sorrow, not the conflict and pain of becoming. When the self is not occupied with its own becoming there is an unpremeditated clarity, a deep ecstasy. This intensity of joy is the outcome of the abandonment of the self.

Questioner: I have struggled for many, many years with a personal problem. I am still struggling. What am I to do?

Krishnamurti: What is the process of understanding a problem? To understand, mind-heart must unburden itself of its accumulation so that it is capable of right perception. If you would understand a modern painting you must, if you can, put aside your classical training, your prejudices, your trained responses. Similarly

becomes. The immature are easily satisfied in their emptiness but the more one is aware the greater is this problem. There is no escape from aching loneliness, nor is it to be overcome by thoughtlessness, by ignorance; ignorance, like superstition, yields a certain gratification but this only furthers conflict and sorrow. Most of us are intensely lonely and the anguish is penetrating and dulls the mind-heart. Its engulfing sorrow seems to spread endlessly and we seek constantly to escape from it, to cover it up, to fill this aching void consciously or unconsciously with hope and faith, with amusement and distraction. We try to cover up its anguish through activity, through the pleasure of knowledge, of belief, and of every form of addiction, religious and worldly. Our search for a refuge, for a comfort from this pain is endless; things, relationships and knowledge are means of escape from the persistent anguish of loneliness. The movement from one escape to another is considered advancement; we condemn the man who fills this void with drink and amusement but the man who seeks a permanent escape, calling it noble, we consider worthy, spiritual.

Is there any enduring escape from this emptiness? We try various ways to fill the void but again and again we become aware of it. Do not all remedies however noble and gratifying merely avoid the problem? You may find temporary relief but anguish soon returns.

To find the right and lasting answer to loneliness we must first cease to run away from it, and this is very difficult for thought is ever seeking a refuge, an escape. It is only when the mind-heart can accept this void unconditionally, yielding to it without any motive, without any hope or fear, that there can be its transformation.

If you would truly understand the problem of loneliness and its greatness the values of the world must be set aside for they are distractions from the Real. These distractions and their values are the outcome of your desire to escape from your own emptiness and so they, too, are empty. Only when the mind-heart is stripped of all its pretensions and formulations can this aching emptiness be transcended.

Questioner: I have had what might be called a spiritual experience, a guidance, or a certain realization. How am I to deal with it?

Krishnamurti: Most of us have had deep experiences, call them by what name you will; we have had experiences of great ecstasy, of great vision, of great love. The experience fills our being with its light, with its breath; but it is not abiding, it passes away, leaving its perfume.

With most of us the mind-heart is not capable of being open to that ecstasy. The experience was accidental, uninvited, too great for the mind-heart. The experience is greater than the experiencer

and so the experienter sets about to reduce it to his own level, to his sphere of comprehension. His mind is not still; it is active, noisy, rearranging; it must "deal" with the experience; it must organize it; it must spread it; it must tell others of its beauty. So the mind reduces the inexpressible into a pattern of authority or a direction for conduct. It interprets and translates the experience and so enmeshes it in its own triviality. Because the mind-heart does not know how to sing it pursues instead the singer.

The interpreter, the translator of the experience, must be as deep and wide as the experience itself if he would understand it; since he is not, he must cease to interpret it; to cease, he must be mature, wise in his understanding. You may have a significant experience but how you understand it, how you interpret it depends on you the interpreter; if your mind-heart is small, limited, then you translate the experience according to your own conditioning. It is this conditioning that must be understood and broken down before you can hope to grasp the full significance of the experience.

The maturity of mind-heart comes as it frees itself from its own limitations and not through clinging to the memory of a spiritual experience. If it clings to memory it abides with death, not with life. Deep experience may open the door to understanding, to self-knowledge and right thinking, but with many it becomes only a stirring stimulation, a memory, and soon loses its vital significance, preventing further experience.

We translate all experience in terms of our own conditioning, the deeper it is the more alertly aware must we be not to misread it. Deep and spiritual experiences are rare and if we have such experiences we reduce them to the petty level of our own mind and heart. If you are a Christian or a Hindu or a non-believer you accordingly translate such experiences, reducing them to the level of your own conditioning. If your mind-heart is given over to nationalism and greed, to passion and ill-will, then such experiences will be used to further the slaughter of your neighbor; then you seek guidance to bomb your brother; then to worship is to destroy or torture those who are not of your country, of your faith.

It is essential to be aware of your conditioning rather than to try to "do something" about the experience itself, but mind-heart clings to the experiences of yesterday and so becomes incapable of understanding the living present.

Existence is painful and complex. To understand the sorrow of our existence we must think-feel anew, we must approach life simply and directly; if we can, we must begin each day anew. We must be able each day to revalue the ideals and patterns that we have brought into being. Life can be deeply and truly understood only as it exists in each one; you are that life and without comprehending it there can be no enduring joy and tranquillity.

Our conflict within and without arises, does it not, from the changing and contradictory values based on pleasure and pain? Our struggle lies in trying to find a value that is wholly satisfying, unvarying and undisturbing; we are seeking permanent value that will ever gratify without any shadow of doubt or pain. Our constant struggle is based on this demand for lasting security; we crave security in things, in relationship, in thought.

Without understanding the problem of insecurity there is no security. If we seek security we shall not find it; the search for security brings its own destruction. There must be insecurity for the comprehension of Reality, the insecurity that is not the opposite of security. A mind that is well anchored, which feels safe in some refuge, can never understand Reality. The craving for security breeds slothfulness; it makes the mind-heart unpliant and insensitive, fearful and dull; it hinders the vulnerability to Reality. In deep insecurity is Truth realized.

But we need a certain security to live; we need food, clothes and shelter, without which existence is not possible. It would be a comparatively simple matter to organize and distribute effectively if we were satisfied with our daily fundamental needs only. Then there would be no individual, no national assertiveness, competitive expansion and ruthlessness; there would be no need for separate sovereign governments; there would be no wars if we were wholly satisfied with our daily needs. But we are not.

Yet why is it not possible to organize our needs? It is not possible because of the incessant conflict of our daily life with its greed, cruelty, hatred. It is not possible because we use our needs as a means of gratifying our psychological demands. Being inwardly uncreative, empty, destructive, we use our needs as a means of escape; so needs assume far greater significance than they really have. Psychologically they become all important; so sensate values assume great significance; property, name, talent, become the means for position, power, domination. Over things made by hand or by mind we are ever in conflict; hence economic planning for existence becomes the dominating problem. We crave for things which create

the illusion of security and comfort but which bring us only conflict, confusion and antagonism. We lose in the security of things made by the mind that joy of creative Reality, the very nature of which is insecurity. A mind that is seeking security is ever in fear; it can never be joyous, it can never know creative being. The highest form of thinking-feeling is negative comprehension and its very basis is insecurity.

The more we consider the world without understanding our psychological cravings, demands and conflicts, the more complex and insoluble the problem of existence becomes. The more we plan and organize our economic existence without understanding and transcending the inner passions, fears, envies, the more conflict and confusion will come into being. Contentment with little comes with the understanding of our psychological problems, not through legislation or the determined effort to possess little. We must eliminate intelligently those psychological demands which find gratification in things, in position, in capacity. If we do not seek power and domination, if we are not self-assertive, there will be peace; but as long as we are using things, relationship or ideas as means to gratify our ever increasing psychological cravings, so long will there be contention and misery. With the freedom from craving there comes right thinking and right thinking alone can bring tranquillity.

Questioner: I come from a part of the world which has suffered terribly in this war. I see around me widespread hunger, disease, and a great danger of civil war and bloodshed unless these problems are tackled immediately. I feel it my duty to make my contribution to their solution. On the other hand I see in the world of today the need for a point of view like yours. Is it possible for me to pursue my first objective without neglecting the second? In other words, how can I continue the two?

Krishnamurti: Only in the search of the Real can there be an enduring solution to our problems. To separate existence from the Real is to continue in ignorance and sorrow. To grapple with the problems of hunger, mass murder and destruction on their own planes, is to further misery and catastrophe. In the search of the Real the world's problem which is the individual problem will find a lasting answer. But if you are only concerned with the reorganization of greed, ill-will and ignorance there will be no end to confusion and antagonism.

If the reformer, the contributor to the solution of the world's problems, has not radically transformed himself, if he has had no inner revolution of values then what he contributes will only add further to conflict and misery. He who is eager to reform the world must first understand himself for he is the world. The present misery

and degradation of man is brought on by man himself and if he merely plans to re-form the pattern of conflict without fundamentally understanding himself he will only increase ignorance and sorrow. If each one seeks eternal value then there will be an end to the conflict within and so peace will come into the world: then only will those causes that perpetuate antagonism, confusion and misery cease.

If you want to put an end to the conflict, confusion and misery with which we are confronted everywhere, from where are you to begin? Are you to begin with the world, with the outer, and try to rearrange its values while maintaining your own nationalism, acquisitiveness and hatred, religious dogma and superstition? Or must you begin with yourself to eliminate drastically those causes that produce conflict and sorrow? If you are able to set aside the passion and worldliness on which present culture is built, then you will discover and experience eternal value which is never within any framework; then you might be able to help others free themselves from bondage. We desire, unfortunately, to combine the eternal with a whole series of values which lead to antagonism, conflict and misery. If you would seek Truth you must abandon those values that are based on sensation and gratification, on passion and ill-will, possessiveness and greed. You need not let your lives be guided by economists, by politicians and priests with their endless plans for peace; they have led you to death and destruction. You have made them your leaders but now, with deep awareness, you must become responsible for yourself for within you is the cause and the solution of all conflict and sorrow. You created it and you alone can free yourself, not another can save you.

Therefore our first duty, if one may use that word, is to search out the Real which alone can bring peace and joy. In it alone is there enduring unity of man; in it alone can conflict and sorrow cease; in it alone is there creative being. Without this inward treasure the outward organization of law and economic planning have little significance. With the awareness of the Real the outer and inner cease to be separate.

Questioner: I have tried to meditate along the lines you suggested last year. I have gone into it fairly deeply. I feel that meditation and dreams have a relationship. What do you think?

Krishnamurti: For those who practise meditation, it is a process of becoming, of building up, of denying or of imitating, of concentration, of narrowing down thought-feeling. They either cultivate virtue as a means towards a formulated end, or try to focus their wandering attention on a saint, a teacher, or an idea. Many use various techniques to go beyond the reach of the means, but the

means shape the mind-heart, and so in the end they become slaves to the means. The means and the end are not different, they are not separate. If you are seeking an end you will find the means for it, but such an end is not the Real. The Real comes into being, you cannot seek it; it must come, you cannot induce it. But meditation as generally practised is craving to become or not to become; it is a subtle form of self-expansion, self-assertiveness; and so it becomes merely a series of struggles within the pattern of duality. The effort of becoming, positively or negatively, on different levels does not put an end to conflict; only with the cessation of craving is there tranquillity.

If the meditator does not know himself his meditation is of little value and becomes even a hindrance to comprehension. Without self-knowledge meditation is not possible, and without meditative awareness there is no self-knowledge. If I do not understand myself, my cravings, my motives, my contradictions, how can I comprehend truth? If I am not aware of my contradictory states, if I am passionate, ignorant, greedy, envious, meditation only strengthens the self-enclosing process; without self-knowledge there is no foundation for right thinking; without right thinking thought-feeling cannot transcend itself.

A lady once said that she had practised meditation for a number of years and presently went on to explain that a certain group of people must be destroyed for they were bringing misery and destruction to man. Yet she practised brotherhood, love and peace, which she said had guided her life. Do not many of you who practise meditation talk of love and brotherhood, yet condone or participate in war which is organized murder? What significance then has your meditation? Your meditation only strengthens your own narrowness, ill-will and ignorance.

Those who would understand the deep significance of meditation must begin first with themselves, for self-knowledge is the foundation of right thinking. Without right thinking how can thought go far? You must begin near to go far. Self-awareness is arduous; to think-out, feel-out every thought-feeling is strenuous; but this awareness of every thought-feeling will bring to an end the wandering of the mind. When you try to meditate do you not find that your mind wanders and chatters ceaselessly? It is of little use to brush aside every thought but one and try to concentrate upon that one thought which you have chosen. Instead of trying to control these wandering thoughts become aware of them, think-out, feel-out every thought, comprehend its significance, however pleasant or unpleasant; try to understand each thought-feeling. Each thought-feeling so pursued will yield its meaning and thus the mind, as it comprehends its own repetitive and wandering thoughts, becomes emptied of its own formulations.

The mind is the result of the past, it is a storehouse of many

interests, of contradictory values; it is ever gathering, ever becoming. We must be aware of these accumulations and understand them as they arise. Suppose you have collected letters for many years; now you look into the drawer and read letter after letter, keeping some and discarding others; what you keep you re-read and again you discard till the drawer is empty. Similarly, be aware of every thought-feeling, comprehend its significance, and should it return reconsider it for it has not been fully understood. As a drawer is useful only when empty so the mind must be free of all its accumulations for only then can there be that openness to wisdom and the ecstasy of the Real. Tranquillity of wisdom is not the result of an act of will, it is not a conclusion, a state to be achieved. It comes into being in the awareness of understanding.

Meditation becomes significant when the mind-heart is aware, thinking-out, feeling-out every thought-feeling that arises without comparison or identification. For identification and comparison maintain the conflict of duality and there is no solution within its pattern. I wonder how many of you have really practised meditation? If you have, you will have noticed how difficult it is to be extensively aware without the narrowing down of thought-feeling. In trying to concentrate, the conflicting thoughts-feelings are suppressed or pushed aside or overcome and through this process there can be no understanding. Concentration is gained at the expense of deep awareness. If the mind is petty and limited, concentration will not make it any the less small and trivial; on the contrary it will strengthen its own nature. Such narrow concentration does not make the mind-heart vulnerable to Reality; it only hardens the mind-heart in its own obstinacy and ignorance and perpetuates the self-enclosing process.

When the mind-heart is extensive, deep and tranquil there is the Real. If the mind is seeking a result, however noble and worthy, if it is concerned with becoming it ceases to be extensive and infinitely pliable. It must be as the unknown to receive the Unknowable. It must be utterly tranquil for the being of the Eternal.

So the mind must understand every value it has accumulated and in this process the many layers of consciousness, both the open and the hidden, are uncovered and understood. The more there is an awareness of the conscious layers the more the hidden layers come to the surface; if the conscious layers are confused and disturbed then the deeper layers of consciousness cannot project themselves into the conscious, save through dreams.

Awareness is the process of freeing the conscious mind from the *bondages* which cause conflict and pain and thus making it open and receptive to the hidden. The hidden layers of consciousness convey their significance through dreams and symbols. If every thought-feeling is thought-out, felt-out, as fully and deeply as possible, without condemnation or comparison, acceptance or identification, then

all the hidden layers of consciousness will reveal themselves. Through constant awareness the dreamer ceases to dream, for through alert and passive awareness every movement of thought-feeling of the open and hidden layers of consciousness is being understood. But if one is incapable of thinking-out, feeling-out every thought completely and fully then one begins to dream. Dreams need interpretation and to interpret there must be free and open intelligence; instead, the dreamer goes to a dream specialist, thus creating for himself other problems. Only in deep extensive awareness can there be an end to dreams and their anxious interpretation.

Right meditation is very effective in freeing the mind-heart from its self-enclosing process. The open and hidden layers of consciousness are the result of the past, of accumulation, of centuries of education, and surely such an educated, conditioned mind cannot be vulnerable to the Real. Occasionally, in the still silence after the storm of conflict and pain, there comes inexpressible beauty and joy; it is not the result of the storm but of the cessation of conflict. The mind-heart must be passively still for the creative being of the Real.

Questioner: Will you please explain the idea that one must die each day, or that one must live the four seasons in a day?

Krishnamurti: Is it not essential that there should be a constant renewal, a rebirth? If the present is burdened with the experience of yesterday there can be no renewal. Renewal is not the action of birth and death; it is beyond the opposites; only freedom from the accumulation of memory brings renewal and there is no understanding save in the present.

Mind can understand the present only if it does not compare, judge; the desire to alter or condemn the present without understanding it gives continuance to the past. Only in comprehending the reflection of the past in the mirror of the present, without distortion, is there renewal.

The accumulation of memory is called knowledge; with this burden, with the scars of experience, thought is ever interpreting the present and so giving continuity to its own scars and conditioning. This continuity is time-binding and so there is no rebirth, no renewal. If you have lived an experience fully, completely, have you not found that it leaves no traces behind? It is only the incomplete experiences that leave their mark, giving continuity to self-identified memory. We consider the present as a means to an end, so the present loses its immense significance. The present is the Eternal. But how can a mind that is made up, put together, understand that which is not put together, which is beyond all value, the Eternal?

As each experience arises live it out as fully and deeply as possible; think it out, feel it out extensively and profoundly; be aware of its pain and pleasure, of your judgments and identifications. Only when experience is completed is there a renewal. We must be capable of living the four seasons in a day; to be keenly aware, to experience, to understand and be free of the gatherings of each day. With the end of each day the mind-heart must empty itself of the accumulation of its pleasures and pains. We gather consciously and unconsciously; it is comparatively easy to discard what has been consciously acquired but it is more difficult for thought to free itself from the unconscious accumulations, the past, the incompleted experiences with their recurring memories. Thought-feeling clings so tenaciously to what it has gathered because it is afraid to be insecure.

Meditation is renewal, the dying each day to the past; it is an intense passive awareness, the burning away of the desire to continue, to become. As long as mind-heart is self-protecting there will be continuity without renewal. Only when the mind ceases to create is there creation.

Questioner: How would you cope with an incurable disease?

Krishnamurti: Most of us do not understand ourselves, our various tensions and conflicts, our hopes and fears, which often produce mental and physical disorders.

Of primary importance is psychological understanding and well being of the mind-heart, which then can deal with the accidents of disease. As a tool wears out so does the body, but those who cling to sensory values find this wasting away to be a sorrow beyond measure; they live for sensation and gratification and the fear of death and pain drives them to delusion. As long as thought-feeling is predominantly sensate there will be no end to delusion and fear; the world in its very nature being a distraction it is essential that the problem of delusion and health be approached patiently and wisely.

If we are organically diseased then let us cope with this condition as with all mechanism, in the best way possible. The psychological delusions, tensions, conflicts, maladjustments produce greater misery than organic disease. We try to eradicate symptoms rather than cause; the cause itself may be sensate value. There is no end to the gratification of the senses which only creates greater and greater turmoil, tension, fear and so on; such a living must culminate in mental and physical disorder or in war. Unless there is a radical change in value there will and must be ever increasing disharmony within, and so, without. This radical change in value must be brought about through understanding the psychological being; if you do not change, your delusions and ill-health will inevitably

increase; you will become unbalanced, depressed, giving continuous employment to physicians. If there is no deep revolution of values then disease and delusion become a distraction, an escape, giving opportunity for self-indulgence. We can unconditionally accept an incurable disease only when thought-feeling is able to transcend the value of time.

The predominance of sensory values cannot bring sanity and health. There must be a cleansing of the mind-heart which cannot be done by any outer agency. There must be self-awareness, a psychological tension. Tension is not necessarily harmful; there must be right exertion of the mind. It is only when tension is not properly utilized that it leads to psychological difficulties and delusions, to ill-health and perversions. Tension of the right kind is essential for understanding; to be alertly and passively aware is to give full attention without the conflict of opposition. Only when this tension is not properly understood does it lead to difficulty; living, relationship, thought demand heightened sensitivity, a right tension. We are conscious of this tension and generally misread or avoid it thus preventing the understanding that it would bring. Tension or sensitivity can heal or destroy.

Life is complex and painful, a series of inner and outer conflicts. There must be an awareness of the mental and emotional attitudes which cause outward and physical disturbances. To understand them you must have time for quiet reflection; to be aware of your psychological states there must be periods of quiet solitude, a withdrawal from the noise and bustle of daily life and its routine. This active stillness is essential not only for the well being of the mind-heart but for the discovery of the Real without which physical or moral well being is of little significance.

Unfortunately most of us give little time to serious and quiet self-recollectedness. We allow ourselves to become mechanical, thoughtlessly following routine, accepting and being driven by authority; we become mere cogs in the vast machine of the present culture. We have lost creativeness; there is no inward joy. What we are inwardly that we project outwardly. Mere cultivation of the outer does not bring about inward well being; only through constant self-awareness and self-knowledge can there be inward tranquillity. Without the Real, existence is conflict and pain.

The problem of relationship is not easily comprehended, it requires patience and pliability of mind-heart; mere adjustment or conformity to a system of conduct does not bring about the understanding of relationship; such adjustment and conformity cloud and intensify the struggle. If we would deeply comprehend relationship it must be approached afresh each day, without the scars or memories of yesterday's experiences. These conflicts in relationship build a wall of continuous resistance and instead of bringing wider and deeper unity create insurmountable differences and disunity.

As you would read an interesting book without skipping a page, so relationship must be studied and understood; the solution to the problem of relationship is not to be found outside of it but in it; the answer is not at the end of the book but is to be found in the manner of our approach to relationship. How you read the book of relationship is of far greater importance than the answer, or the overcoming of the struggle that exists in it. It must be approached every day anew without the burden of yesterday; it is this liberation from yesterday, from time, that brings creative understanding.

To be is to be related; there is no such thing as isolated being. Relationship is a conflict within and without; the inward conflict extended becomes world conflict. You and the world are not separate; your problem is the world's problem; you bear the world in you; without you it is not. There is no isolation and there is no object that is not related. This conflict must be understood not as a problem of the part but of the whole.

You are aware, are you not, of conflict in relationship, of the constant struggle between you and another, between you and the world? Why is there conflict in relationship? Does it not arise because of the interaction of dependency and conformity, of domination and possessiveness? We conform, we depend, we possess because of inward insufficiency which gives rise to fear. Do we not know this fear in intimate, close relationship? Relationship is a tension, and deep awareness is necessary to understand it.

Why do we crave to possess or dominate? Is it not because of the fear of insufficiency? Being fearful we long to be secure; emotionally and mentally we desire to be safe and well anchored in things, in people, in ideas. Inwardly we crave security which expresses itself outwardly in dependency, conformity, possessiveness and so on. It is the burning and seemingly ceaseless void that drives us to find a refuge, a hope, in relationship, and we confuse the urge to avoid our anguish of loneliness with love, duty, responsibility.

But what is the true significance of relationship? Is it not a

process of self-revelation? Is not relationship a mirror in which, if we are aware, we can observe without distortion our private thoughts and motives, our inward state? In relationship the subtle process of the self, of the ego, is revealed and through choiceless awareness alone can inward insufficiency be transcended. Conflict ceases in the aloneness of Reality. This transcending is love. Love has no motive; it is its own eternity.

Questioner: How can I become integrated?

Krishnamurti: What do we mean by integration? Does it not mean to be made whole, to be without conflict and sorrow?

Most of us try to be integrated within the superficial layers of our consciousness; we try to integrate ourselves so as to function normally within the pattern of society; we desire to fit into an environment which we accept as being normal; but we do not question the significance or the value of the social structure about us. Conformity to a pattern is considered integration; education and organized religion aid us towards this conformity.

Has not integration a deeper significance than mere adjustment to society and its patterns? Is conformity integration? Is not integration pure being and not just the satisfaction of our desire to be made whole, to become normal? The motive behind the urge for integration is surely of great significance.

The urge for integration may arise from ambition, from the desire for power, from the fear of insufficiency and so on. Coordination is necessary to achieve a result, but consider what is involved in the idea of attainment of desire; self-assertiveness, envy, enmity, the pettiness of success, strife and pain. Some people suppress the craving for worldly success but indulge in the craving to become virtuous, to be a Master, to attain spiritual glory, but the craving to become ever leads to conflict, confusion and antagonism. This again is not true integration. True integration comes when there is awareness and so understanding through all layers of consciousness. Our superficial consciousness is the result of education, of influence and only when thought transcends its own self-created limitation can there be true integration. The many opposing and contradictory parts of our consciousness can be integrated only when the creator of these divisions ceases to be; within the pattern of the self there can be only conflict, there can never be integration, completeness.

Integration comes with the freedom from craving. It is not an end in itself but if you seek self-knowledge, ever deeply, then integration becomes the way to Reality.

Questioner: You may be wise about some things but why are you, as it has been represented to me, against organization? Would you please explain why you consider it a hindrance in our search for Reality?

Krishnamurti: Why do we organize? Is it not for efficiency? We organize our existence in order to live; we can organize our thought-feeling so as to make it efficient but efficient for what? For killing, oppressing, gaining power?

If certain ideas, beliefs, doctrines appeal to you, you join with others to spread effectively what you believe and for this you create an organization. But is the understanding of Reality the result of propaganda, organized belief, enforced or subtle conformity? Is Reality discovered through the doctrines of churches, cults or sects? Is Reality to be found through compulsion, through imitation?

We think, do we not, that through conformity, through formulation of beliefs we shall know the Real? Must not thought-feeling transcend all conditioning to discover the Real? Thought-feeling now experiences that in which it is educated, in which it believes, but such experience is limited and narrow; such a mind cannot experience the Real. Conformity can be organized efficiently; adherence to a formula, to a doctrine can be effectively manipulated but will that lead to Reality? Does not Reality come into being when there is complete liberation from all authority, from all compulsion and imitation? This state of being we experience only when thought is utterly still. Only in freedom is there the experience of the Real.

Regimentation of thought-feeling in the name of religion, peace and freedom is made attractive and acceptable; your tendency is to accept authority; you desire to be led; you look to others to direct your conduct. The radio, movies, newspapers, governments, churches are moulding your thought and feeling, and because you desire to conform their task becomes easy. Your craving for security creates fear and it is fear that yields to the oppression of authority; fear forces you not *how* to think but *what* to think. Only in freedom from fear is there the discovery of the Real.

Group effort, without conforming to authority, could be very significant through the revelation of inward individual motives and purposes; the group could mirror the activities of the self and through relationship awaken self-awareness. But if the group is used for self-assertiveness through propaganda or as a means of escape then it can become a hindrance to the discovery of Truth.

Creativeness comes into being when thought-feeling is not held within any pattern, within any formulation. The self is the result of conformity, of conditioning, of accumulated memory; so the self is never free to discover; it can only expand in its own conditioning and organize itself to be efficient and subtle in its assertiveness, pursuits and demands, but it can never be free. Only when the self ceases to become is there the Real. To be free to discover, the memory of yesterday must cease; it is the burden of the past that gives continuity and continuity is conformity. Do not conform in in order to be free for this does not bring freedom and in freedom

alone is there creative being. Freedom cannot be organized and when it is it ceases to be freedom. We try to enclose the living Truth in gratifying patterns of thought-feeling and thereby destroy it.

Questioner: I would like to ask you if the Masters are not a great source of inspiration to us. As life is unequal there must be Master and pupil, surely?

Krishnamurti: Is not this inequality the result of ignorance? Does not this division of man into the high and low deny the Real? Is not this domination and submission of man the outcome of ignorance and thoughtlessness?

Our social structure is built upon division and difference of levels of the clerk and the executive, the general and the soldier, the bishop and the priest, the one who knows and the one who does not know. This division is based on sensate value, which sets man against man. This social pattern breeds endless opposition and antagonism and there can be an end to conflict within this pattern only when thought-feeling transcends greed, ill-will and ignorance.

With our acquisitive and competitive mentality we try to grasp Reality and build a ladder for achievement; we create the high and the low, the Master and the pupil. We think of Reality as an end to be achieved, as a reward for righteousness; we think it is to be attained through time, and so maintain the constant division between Master and pupil, the successful and the ignorant.

The wise, the compassionate do not think of man in terms of division; the foolish are caught up in the social and religious division of man. Those who are conscious of this division and know it to be false and stupid overcome it but yet they persist in division with regard to those they call Masters. If you perceive the misery in this sensate world caused by the division of man into the high and the low, why then are you not aware of it on all planes of existence? In the sensate world the division of man against man is the result of greed and ignorance and it is also greed and ignorance that create the follower and the leader, the Master and the pupil, the liberated and the unenlightened.

The questioner asks if a Master or a saint is not a source of inspiration. When you draw inspiration from another it is only a distraction, hence uncreative and illusory. Inspiration is sought in many ways but invariably it breeds dependence and fear. Fear prevents understanding, it puts an end to communion, it is a living death.

Is not the creative being of Reality the norm? You look to others for hope and guidance because you are empty and poor; you turn to books, to pictures, to teachers, to gurus, to saviors to inspire and strengthen you, you are ever in hunger, ever seeking but never finding. In the creative being of Reality alone is there the

cessation of conflict and sorrow. But separation and inequality will be maintained as long as there is a becoming; as long as the pupil craves to become a Master. This craving to become is born of ignorance for the present is the Eternal. Only in the aloneness of Reality is there completeness; in that flame of creative being there is no other but the One.

Through right means only can Reality be discovered for the means is the end; the means and the end are inseparable; through self-awareness and self-knowledge there is the flame of Reality. It does not lie through another but through your own awakened thought. None can lead you to it; none can deliver you from your own sorrow. The authority of another is blinding; only in utter freedom is the Supreme to be found. Let us live in time timelessly.

Questioner: Do you believe in progress?

Krishnamurti: There is the movement of so-called progression, is there not, from the simple to the complex? There is the process of constant adjustment to environment which brings about modification or change, taking on new forms. There is constant interaction between the outer and the inner, each aiding in modifying and transforming the other. This does not demand belief; we can observe society becoming more and more complex, more and more efficiently organized to survive, to exploit, to oppress and to kill. Existence which was simple and primitive has become very complex, highly organized and civilized. We have "progressed"; we have radios, movies, quick means of transportation and all the rest of it. We can kill, instead of a few, thousands upon thousands in a moment; we can wipe out, as the phrase goes, whole cities and their people in a few burning seconds. We are well aware of all this and some call it progress; bigger and better houses, more luxury, more amusements, more distractions. Can this be considered progress? Is the expansion of sensate desire progress? Or does progress lie in compassion?

We mean by progress also, do we not, the constant expanding of desire, of the self? Now in this process of expansion and becoming can there ever be an end to conflict and sorrow? If not, what is the purpose of becoming? If it is for the continuation of struggle and pain, of what value is progress, the evolution of desire, the expansion of the self? If in the expansion of desire there is the cessation of sorrow then becoming could have significance, but is it not the very nature of craving to create and continue conflict and sorrow?

The self, the I, this bundle of memories, is the result of the past, the product of time, and will this self, however much it may evolve, experience the Timeless? Can the I, becoming greater, nobler through time, experience the Real?

Can the I, the accumulated memory, know freedom? Can the

self which is craving, and so the cause of ignorance and conflict, know enlightenment? Only in freedom can there be enlightenment, not in the bondage and pain of craving. As long as the I thinks of itself as gaining and losing, becoming and not becoming, thought is time-bound. Thought held in the bondage of yesterday, of time, can never experience the Timeless.

We think in terms of yesterday, today and tomorrow; I was, I am and I will become. We think-feel in terms of accumulation; we are constantly creating and maintaining the idea of time, of continual becoming. Is not being wholly different from becoming? We can only be when we understand the process and significance of becoming. If we would deeply understand we must be silent, must we, not? The very greatness of a problem calls for silence as does beauty. But, you will be asking, how am I to become silent, how am I to stop this incessant chattering of the mind? There is no becoming silent; there is or there is not silence. If you are aware of the immensity of being then there is silence; its very intensity brings tranquillity.

Character can be modified, changed, made harmonious, but character is not Reality. Thought must transcend itself to comprehend the Timeless. When we think of progress, growth, are we not thinking-feeling within the pattern of time? There is a becoming, modifying or changing in the horizontal process; this becoming knows pain and sorrow but will this lead to Reality? It cannot for becoming is ever time-binding. It is only when thought frees itself from becoming, liberates itself from the past through diligent self-awareness, is utterly tranquil, that there is the Timeless.

This tranquillity of understanding is not produced by an act of will for will is still a part of becoming, of craving. Mind-heart can be tranquil only when the storm and the conflict of craving have ceased. As a lake is calm when the winds stop, so the mind is tranquil in wisdom when it understands and transcends its own craving and distraction. This craving is to be understood as it is disclosed in every day thought-feeling-action; through constant self-awareness are the ways of craving, self-becoming, understood and transcended. Do not depend on time but be arduous in the search of self-knowledge.

Questioner: In answering the question of how to solve a psychological problem lastingly, you spoke about the three consecutive phases in the process of solving such a problem, the first one being the consideration of its cause and effect; secondly, the understanding of that particular problem as part of the dualistic conflict; and then the discovery that the thinker and the thought are one. It seems to me that the first and second steps are comparatively easy, while the third level cannot be attained in a similar simple, logical progression.

Krishnamurti: I wonder if you have observed for yourself the three phases I suggested in trying to solve a psychological problem? Most of us can be aware of the cause and effect of a problem and also be aware of its dualistic conflict, but the questioner feels that the last step, the discovery that the thinker and the thought are one, is not so easy nor can it be understood logically. These three states or steps I suggested only for the convenience of verbal communication; they flow from one to the other; they are not fixed within a framework of different levels. It is really important to understand they are not different stages, one superior to the other; they hang on the same thread of understanding. There is an interrelationship between cause and effect and the dualistic conflict and the discovery that the thinker and his thought are one.

Cause and effect are inseparable; in the cause is the effect. To be aware of the cause-effect of a problem needs certain swift pliability of mind-heart for the cause-effect is constantly being modified, undergoing continual change. What once was cause-effect may have become modified now and to be aware of this modification or change is surely necessary for true understanding. To follow the ever changing cause-effect is strenuous for the mind clings and takes shelter in what was the cause-effect; it holds to conclusions and so conditions itself to the past. There must be an awareness of this cause-effect conditioning; it is not static but the mind is when it holds fast to a cause-effect that is immediately past. Karma is this bondage to cause-effect. As thought itself is the result of many causes-effects it must extricate itself from its own bondages. The problem of cause-effect is not to be superficially observed and passed by. It is the continuous chain of conditioning memory that must be observed and understood; to be aware of this chain being created and to follow it though all the layers of consciousness is arduous; yet it must be deeply searched out and understood.

So long as the thinker is concerned with his thought there must be dualism; as long as he struggles with his thoughts dualistic conflict will continue. Is there a solution for a problem in the conflict of opposites? Is not the maker of the problem more important than the problem itself? Thought can go above and beyond its dualistic conflict only when the thinker is not separate from his thought. If the thinker is acting upon his thought he will maintain himself apart and so ever be the cause of opposing conflict. In the conflict of dualism there is no answer to any problem for in that state the thinker is ever separate from his thought. Craving remains and yet the object of craving is constantly being changed; what is important is to understand craving itself, not the object of craving.

Is the thinker different from his thought? Are they not a joint phenomenon? Why does the thinker separate himself from his thought? Is it not for his own continuity? He is ever seeking security, permanency, and as thoughts are impermanent the thinker thinks

of himself as the permanent. The thinker hides behind his thoughts and without transforming himself tries to change the frame of his thought. He conceals himself behind the activity of his thoughts to safeguard himself. He is ever the observer manipulating the observed, but he is the problem and not his thoughts. It is one of the subtle ways of the thinker to be troubled about his thoughts and thereby avoid his own transformation.

If the thinker separates his thought from himself and tries to modify it without radically transforming himself conflict and delusion inevitably will follow. There is no way out of this conflict and illusion save through the transformation of the thinker himself. This complete integration of the thinker with his thought is not on the verbal level but is a profound experience which comes only when cause-effect is understood and the thinker is no longer caught in dualistic opposition. Through self-knowledge and right meditation the integration of the thinker with his thought takes place and then only can the thinker go above and beyond himself. Then only the thinker ceases to be. In right meditation the concentrator is the concentration; as generally practised the thinker is the concentrator, concentrating upon something or becoming something. In right meditation the thinker is not separate from his thought. On rare occasions we experience this integration in which the thinker has wholly ceased; then only is there creation, eternal being. Till the thinker is silent he is the maker of problems, of conflict and sorrow.

IX

The desire to be secure in things and in relationship only brings about conflict and sorrow, dependence and fear; the search for happiness in relationship without understanding the cause of conflict leads to misery. When thought lays emphasis on sensate value and is dominated by it there can be only strife and pain. Without self-knowledge relationship becomes a source of struggle and antagonism, a device for covering up inward insufficiency, inward poverty.

Does not craving for security in any form indicate inward insufficiency? Does not this inner poverty make us seek, accept and cling to formulations, hopes, dogmas, beliefs, possessions; is not our

action then merely imitative and compulsive? So anchored to ideology, belief, our thinking becomes merely a process of enchainment.

Our thought is conditioned by the past; the I, the me and the mine, is the result of stored up experience, ever incomplete. The memory of the past is always absorbing the present; the self which is memory of pleasure and pain is ever gathering and discarding, ever forging anew the chains of its own conditioning. It is building and destroying but always within its own self-created prison. To the pleasant memory it clings and the unpleasant it discards. Thought must transcend this conditioning for the being of the Real.

Is evaluating right thinking? Choice is conditioned thinking; right thinking comes through understanding the chooser, the censor. As long as thought is anchored in belief, in ideology, it can only function within its own limitation; it can only feel-act within the boundaries of its own prejudices; it can only experience according to its own memories which give continuity to the self and its bondage. Conditioned thought prevents right thinking which is non-evaluation, non-identification.

There must be alert self-observation without choice; choice is evaluation and evaluation strengthens the self-identifying memory. If we wish to understand deeply there must be passive and choiceless awareness which allows experience to unfold itself and reveal its own significance. The mind that seeks security through the Real creates only illusion. The Real is not a refuge; it is not the reward for righteous action; it is not an end to be gained.

Questioner: Should we not doubt your experience and what you say? Though certain religions condemn doubt as a fetter is it not, as you have expressed it, a precious ointment a necessity?

Krishnamurti: Is it not important to find out why doubt ever arises at all? What is the cause of doubt? Does it not arise when there is the following of another? So the problem is not doubt but the cause of acceptance. Why do we accept, why do we follow?

We follow another's authority, another's experience and then doubt it; this search for authority and its sequel, disillusionment, is a painful process for most of us. We blame or criticize the once-accepted authority, the leader, the teacher, but we do not examine our own craving for an authority who can direct our conduct. Once we understand this craving we shall comprehend the significance of doubt.

Is there not in us a deep rooted tendency to seek direction, to accept authority? Wherefrom does this urge in us come? Does it not arise from our own uncertainty, from our own incapacity to know what is true at all times? We want another to chart for us the sea of

self-knowledge; we desire to be secure, we desire to find a safe refuge and so we follow anyone who will direct us. Uncertainty and fear seek guidance and compel obedience and worship of authority; tradition, education create for us many patterns of obedience. If sometimes we do not accept and obey symbols of outward authority we create our own inner authority, the subtle voice of our self. But through obedience freedom cannot be known; freedom comes with understanding, not through acceptance of authority nor through imitation.

The desire for self-expansion creates obedience and acceptance which in turn give rise to doubt. We conform and obey for we crave self-expansion and thus we become thoughtless. Acceptance leads to thoughtlessness and doubt. Experience, especially that called religious, gives us great joy and we use it as a guide, a reference; but when that experience ceases to sustain and inspire us we begin to doubt it. Doubt arises only when we accept. But is it not foolish, thoughtless to accept an experience of another? It is you who must think-out, feel-out and be vulnerable to the Real, but you cannot be open if you cover yourself with the cloak of authority, whether that of another or of your own creation. It is far more essential to understand the craving for authority, for direction, than to praise or dispel doubt. In comprehending the craving for direction doubt ceases. Doubt has no place in creative being.

He who clings to the past, to memory, is ever in conflict. Doubt does not put an end to conflict; only when craving is understood can there be the bliss of the Real. Beware of the man who says he knows.

Questioner: I want to understand myself, I want to put an end to my stupid struggles and make a definite effort to live fully and truly.

Krishnamurti: What do you mean when you use the term *myself*? As you are many and ever changing is there an enduring moment when you can say that this is the *ever me*? It is the multiple entity, the bundle of memories that must be understood and not seemingly the one entity that calls itself the me.

We are ever-changing contradictory thoughts-feelings: love and hate, peace and passion, intelligence and ignorance. Now which is the me in all of this? Shall I choose what is most pleasing and discard the rest? Who is it that must understand these contradictory and conflicting selves? Is there a permanent self, a spiritual entity apart from these? Is not that self also the continuing result of the conflict of many entities? Is there a self that is above and beyond all contradictory selves? The truth of it can be experienced only when the contradictory selves are understood and transcended.

All the conflicting entities which make up the me have also brought into being the other me, the observer, the analyser. To

understand myself I must understand the many parts of myself including the I who has become the watcher, the I who understands. The thinker must not only understand his many contradictory thoughts but he must understand himself as the creator of these many entities. The I, the thinker, the observer watches his opposing and conflicting thoughts-feelings as though he were not part of them, as though he were above and beyond them, controlling, guiding, shaping. But is not the I, the thinker, also these conflicts? Has he not created them? Whatever the level, is the thinker separate from his thoughts? The thinker is the creator of opposing urges, assuming different roles at different times according to his pleasure and pain. To comprehend himself the thinker must come upon himself through his many aspects. A tree is not just the flower and the fruit but is the total process. Similarly to understand myself I must without identification and choice be aware of the total process that is the me.

How can there be understanding when one part is used as a means of comprehending the other? Is it possible to understand one contradiction by another? There is understanding only when contradiction as a whole ceases, when thought is not identifying itself with the part.

So it is important to understand the desire to condemn or approve, to justify or compare for it is this desire that prevents the full comprehension of the whole being. Who is the judge, who is the entity that is comparing, analysing? Is he not an aspect only of the total process, an aspect of the self that is ever maintaining conflict? Conflict is not dissolved by introducing another entity who may represent condemnation, justification or love. In freedom alone can there be understanding but freedom is denied when the observer through identification condemns or justifies. Only in understanding the process as a whole can right thinking open the door to the Eternal.

Questioner: As you are so much against authority are there any unmistakable signs by which the liberation of another can be objectively recognized, apart from the personal affirmation of the individual regarding his own attainment?

Krishnamurti: It is again the problem of acceptance differently stated, is it not? Suppose one does assert that one is liberated, of what great significance is it to another? Suppose you are free from sorrow, of what importance is it to another? It becomes significant only if one seeks to free oneself from ignorance, for it is ignorance that causes sorrow. So the primary point is not who has attained but how to free thought from its self-enchaining sorrow. Most of us are not concerned with this essential issue but rather with outward

signs by which we may recognize one who is liberated in order that he may heal our sorrows. We desire gain rather than understanding; our craving for guidance, for comfort, makes us accept authority and so we are ever seeking the expert. You are the cause of your sorrow and you alone can understand and transcend it, none can give you deliverance from ignorance save yourself.

It is not important who has attained but it is important to be aware of your attitude and how you listen to what is being said. We listen with hope and fear; we seek the light of another but are not alertly passive to be able to understand. If the liberated seems to fulfill our desires we accept him; if not, we continue our search for the one who will; what most of us desire is gratification at different levels. What is important is not how to recognize one who is liberated but how to understand yourself. No authority here or hereafter can give you knowledge of yourself; without self-knowledge there is no liberation from ignorance, from sorrow.

You are the creator of misery as you are the creator of ignorance and authority; you bring the leader into being and follow him; your craving fashions the pattern of your religious and worldly life so it is essential to understand yourself and so transform the way of your life. Be aware of why you follow another, why you search out authority, why you crave direction in conduct; be aware of the ways of craving. The mind-heart has become insensitive through fear and gratification of authority but through deep awareness of thought-feeling comes the quickening of life. Through choiceless awareness the total process of your being is understood; through passive awareness comes enlightenment.

Questioner: Though you have answered several questions on meditation I find that you have not said anything about group meditation. Should one meditate with others or alone?

Krishnamurti: What is meditation? Is it not the understanding of the ways of the self, is it not self-knowledge? Without self-knowledge, without awareness of the total process that which you build into character, that which you strive for, has no reality. Self-knowledge is the very beginning of true meditation. Now will you understand yourself through being alone or with many? The many can be a hindrance to meditation as can also the being alone. The very weight of ignorance of the many who do not understand themselves can overpower one who is attempting to understand himself through meditation. The group can stimulate one but is stimulation meditation? Dependence on the group creates conformity; congregational worship or prayer is susceptible to suggestion, to influence, to thoughtlessness.

To meditate in isolation can also create hindrances and strengthen

one's prejudices and conformities. If there is no pliability, eager awareness, mere living alone strengthens one's tendencies and idiosyncrasies, hardens the habits and deepens the grooves of thought-feeling. Without understanding the significance of meditation, meditating alone can become a self-enclosing process, the narrowing of mind-heart in self-delusion and the strengthening of obstinacy and credulity.

So whether you meditate with a group or by yourself will have little meaning if the significance of meditation is not rightly understood. Meditation is not concentration, it is the creative process of self-discovery and understanding; meditation is not a process of self-becoming; beginning with self-knowledge it brings tranquillity and supreme wisdom, it opens the door to the Eternal. The purpose of meditation is to be aware of the total process of the self. The self is the result of the past and does not exist in isolation; it is made up. The many causes that have brought it into being must be understood and transcended; only through deep awareness and meditation can there be liberation from craving, from self. Then only is there true aloneness. But when you meditate by yourself you are not alone for you are the result of innumerable influences, of conflicting forces. You are a result, a product, and that which is made up, selected, put together, cannot understand that which is not. When the thinker and his thought are one, having gone above and beyond all formulation, there is that tranquillity in which alone is the Real. To meditate is to penetrate the many conditioned, educated layers of consciousness.

Since we are self-enclosed, in conflict and pain, it is essential to be keenly aware for through self-knowledge thought-feeling frees itself from its own self-created impediments of ill-will and ignorance, worldliness and craving. It is this meditative understanding that is creative; this understanding brings about not withdrawal, not exclusion, but spontaneous solitude.

The more we are meditatively aware during the so-called waking hours the less there are dreams, and less is the anxious fear of their interpretation; for if there is self-awareness during waking hours the different layers of consciousness are being uncovered and understood and in sleep there is the continuation of awareness. Meditation is not for a set period only but is to be continued during the waking hours and hours of sleep as well. In sleep, because of right meditative awareness during waking hours, thought can penetrate depths that have great significance. Even in sleep meditation continues.

Meditation is not a practice; it is not the cultivation of habit; meditation is heightened awareness. Mere practice dulls the mind-heart for habit denotes thoughtlessness and causes insensitivity. Right meditation is a liberative process, a creative self-discovery which frees thought-feeling from bondage. In freedom alone is there the Real.

Questioner: In discussing the problem of illness you introduced the concept of psychological tension. If I remember correctly you stated that the non-use or abuse of psychological tension is the cause of illness. Modern psychology on the other hand mostly stresses relaxation, release from nervous tension and so forth. What do you think?

Krishnamurti: Must we not be strenuous if we would understand? As you are listening to this talk is there not attention, a tension? Is not all awareness an intensity of right tension? Awareness is necessary for comprehension; a strenuous attention is needed if we would grasp the full significance of a problem. Relaxation is necessary, sometimes beneficial; but is not awareness, right tension, necessary for deep understanding? Must not the strings of a violin be tuned or stretched to produce the right tone? If they are stretched too much they break and if they are not stretched or tuned just rightly they do not give the correct tone. Likewise we break down when our nerves are strained too much; tension beyond endurance causes various forms of mental and physical disorders.

But is not awareness, the widening and stretching of the mind-heart, necessary for understanding? Is understanding the result of relaxation, inattention, or does it come with awareness in which there is not that tension caused by the desire to grasp, to gain? Is not alert stillness necessary for deep understanding?

Tension can either mend or mar. In all relationship is there not tension? This tension becomes harmful when relationship becomes an escape from one's own insufficiency, a self-protective shelter from painful self-discovery. Tension becomes harmful when relationship hardens and is no longer a self-revealing process. Most of us use relationship for self-gratification, self-aggrandizement, but when it fails us a harmful tension is created which leads to frustration, jealousy, delusion and conflict. As long as the craving of the self continues there will be the harmful psychological tension of inner insufficiency that causes varieties of delusion and misery. But to understand emptiness, aching loneliness, there must be right awareness, right tension. The tension of greed, fear, ambition, hate, is destructive, is productive of psychological and physical ailments, and to transcend that tension there must be choiceless awareness.

Craving which expresses itself in many ways, in the material and so-called spiritual world, is the cause of conflict in all the different layers of consciousness. The tension of becoming is endless conflict and pain. In being aware of craving and so understanding it thought liberates itself from ignorance and sorrow.

Is there an enduring state of creative tranquillity? Is there an end to the seemingly endless struggle of the opposites? Is there an imperishable ecstasy?

The end to conflict and sorrow is through understanding and transcending the ways of the self and in discovering that imperishable Reality which is not the creation of the mind. Self-knowledge is arduous but without it ignorance and pain continue; without self-knowledge there can be no end to strife.

The world is splintered into many fragments, each in contention with the other; it is torn apart by antagonism, greed and passion; it is broken up by warring ideologies, beliefs and fears; neither organized religion nor politics can bring peace to man. Man is against man and the many explanations of his sorrow do not take away his pain. We have tried to escape from ourselves in many cunning ways but escape only dulls and hardens the mind and heart. The outer world is but an expression of our own inner state; as we are inwardly broken up and torn by burning desires, so is the world about us; as there is incessant turmoil within us so is there endless conflict in the world; as there is no inward tranquillity the world has become a battlefield. What we are the world is.

Is there a possibility of finding enduring joy? There is, but to experience it there must be freedom. Without freedom truth cannot be discovered, without freedom there can be no experience of the Real. Freedom must be sought out; freedom from saviors, teachers, leaders; freedom from the self-enclosing walls of good and bad; freedom from authority and imitation; freedom from self, the cause of conflict and pain.

Just as long as craving in its different forms is not understood there will be conflict and pain. Conflict is not to be ended through superficial restatement of values nor by change of teachers and leaders. The ultimate solution lies in freedom from craving; not in another but in yourself is the way. The incessant battle within us all which we call existence cannot be brought to an end save through understanding and so transcending craving.

The conflict of acquisitiveness appears in knowledge, in relationship, in possessions; acquisitiveness in any form creates inequality and brutality. This division and conflict between man and man is not to be abolished through mere reform of the outer effects and values. Equality in possessions is not the way out of our extended and enveloping misery and stupidity; no revolution can free man from this spirit of exclusiveness. You may dislodge him from possessions through legislation, through revolution, but he will cling

to exclusive relationship or belief. This spirit of exclusiveness at different levels cannot be abolished through any outward reform or through compulsion or regimentation. Yet it is this spirit of exclusiveness that breeds inequality and contention. Does not acquisitiveness set man against man? Can equality and compassion be established through any means of the mind? Must not they be sought elsewhere; does not this separativeness cease only in Love, in Truth?

The unity of man is to be found only in Love, in the illumination that Truth brings. This oneness of man is not to be established through mere economic and social readjustment. The world is ever occupied with this superficial adjustment; it is ever trying to rearrange values within the pattern of acquisitiveness; it tries to establish security on the insecurity of craving and so brings disaster upon itself. We hope that outward revolution, outward change of values will transform man; they do affect him but acquisitiveness, finding gratification at other levels continues. This endless and purposeless movement of acquisitiveness cannot at any time bring peace to man, and only when he is free of it can there be creative being.

Acquisitiveness creates division of those ahead and those behind. You must be both pupil and Master in search of Truth; you must make the approach directly without the conflict of example and following. There must be persistent self-awareness, and the more earnest and strenuous you are the more thought will free itself from its own self-created bondages.

In the bliss of the Real the experiencer and the experience cease. A mind-heart that is burdened with the memory of yesterday cannot live in the eternal present. Mind-heart must die each day for eternal being.

Questioner: I feel that at least to me what you are saying is something new and very vitalizing but the old intrudes and distorts. It seems that the new is overpowered by the past. What is one to do?

Krishnamurti: Thought is the result of the past acting in the present; the past is constantly sweeping over the present. The present, the new, is ever being absorbed by the past, by the known. To live in the eternal present there must be death to the past, to memory; in this death there is timeless renewal.

The present extends into the past and into the future; without the understanding of the present the door to the past is closed. The perception of the new is so fleeting; no sooner is it felt than the swift current of the past sweeps over it and the new ceases to be. To die to the many yesterdays, to renew each day is only possible if we are capable of being passively aware. In this passive awareness there is

no gathering to oneself; in it there is intense stillness in which the new is ever unfolding, in which silence is ever extending without measure.

We try to use the new as a means of breaking down or strengthening the past and so corrupt the living present. The renewing present brings comprehension of the past. It is the new that gives understanding and in that light the past has a fresh, life-giving significance. When we listen to or experience something new our instinctive response is to compare it with the old, with a past experience, with a fading memory. This comparing gives strength to the past, distorting the present and so the new is ever becoming the past, the dead. If thought-feeling were capable of living in the now without distorting it then the past would be transformed into the eternal present.

To some of you these talks and discussions may have brought a new and vitalizing understanding; what is important is not to put the new into old patterns of thought or phrase. Let it remain new, uncontaminated. If it is true it will cast out the old, the past, by its very abundant and creative light. The desire to make the creative present enduring, practical or useful makes it worthless. Let the new live without anchorage in the past, without the distorting influence of fears and hopes.

Die to your experience, to your memory. Die to your prejudice, pleasant or unpleasant. As you die there is the incorruptible; this is not a state of nothingness but of creative being. It is this renewal that will, if allowed, dissolve our problems and sorrows however intricate and painful. Only in death of the self is there life.

Questioner: Do you believe in karma?

Krishnamurti: The desire to believe should be understood and put away for it does not bring enlightenment. He who is seeking Truth does not believe; he who is approaching Truth has no dogma or creed; he who is seeking the Timeless must be free of formulation and the time-binding quality of memory. When we believe we do not seek and belief brings doubt and pain. Search to understand, not to know; for in understanding, the dual process of the knower and the known ceases. In the mere search for knowledge the knower is ever becoming and so is ever in conflict and sorrow. He who asserts he knows does not know.

The root of the Sanscrit word *karma* means to act, to do. Action is the result of a cause. War is the result of our everyday life of stupidity and ill-will and greed; conflict and sorrow are the outcome of the inward turmoil of our craving. Is not our existence the product of enchainning conditioning? Cause is ever undergoing a modification and alert awareness is necessary to follow and understand it. Silent and choiceless awareness not only reveals the cause but also frees

thought-feeling from it. Can effect be separated from cause? Is not effect ever present in the cause? We desire to reform, to rearrange the effects without radically altering the cause. This occupation with effect is a form of escape from the basic cause.

As the end is in the means, so the effect is in the cause. It is comparatively easy to discover the superficial cause but to discover and transcend craving, which is the deep cause of all conditioning, is arduous and demands constant awareness.

Questioner: Not only is there the fear of life but great is the fear of death. How am I to conquer it?

Krishnamurti: What is conquerable has to be conquered again and again. Fear comes to an end only through understanding. Fear of death is in the craving for self-fulfillment; we are empty and we crave completeness, so there is fear; we desire to achieve and so we are afraid lest death should call us. We desire time for understanding, the fulfillment of ambition needs time, and so we are afraid of death. We are in the bondage of time; death is the unknown and of the unknown we are afraid. Fear and death are the companions of life. We crave the assurance of self-continuity. Thought-feeling is moving from the known to the known and is always afraid of the unknown. Thought-feeling proceeds from accumulation to accumulation, from memory to memory, and the fear of death is the fear of frustration.

Because we are as the dead we fear death; the living do not. The dead are burdened by the past, by memory, by time, but for the living the present is the eternal. Time is not a means to the end, the Timeless, for the end is in the beginning. The self weaves the net of time and thought is caught in it. The insufficiency of the self, its aching emptiness, causes the fear of death and of life. This fear is with us always: in our activities, our pleasures and pain. Being dead we seek life but life is not found through the continuity of the self. The self, the maker of time, must yield itself to the Timeless.

If death is truly a great problem for you, not merely a verbal or emotional issue nor a matter of curiosity which can be appeased by explanations, then in you there is deep silence. In active stillness fear ceases; silence has its own creative quickening. You do not transcend fear through rationalization, through the study of explanations; the fear of death does not come to an end through some belief for belief is still within the net of the self. The very noise of the self prevents its own dissolution. We consult, analyze, pray, exchange explanations; this incessant activity and noise of the self hinders the bliss of the Real. Noise can produce only more noise and in it there is no understanding.

Understanding comes when your whole being is deeply and silently aware. Silent awareness is not to be compelled or induced; in this tranquillity death yields to creation.

Questioner: It has never occurred to me to think of myself as being able to attain liberation. The ultimate I can conceive of is that perhaps I might be able to hold and strengthen that entirely incomprehensible relation to God which is the only thing I live by; and I really do not even know what that is.

You talk about being and becoming. I realize that these words mean fundamentally different attitudes and mine has been definitely one of becoming. I now want to transform what has been becoming all along into being. Am I fooling myself? I do not want simply to change words.

Krishnamurti: We must first understand the process of becoming and all its implications before we can comprehend what is being. Is not the structure of our thought-feeling based on time? Do we not think-feel in terms of gain and loss, of becoming and not becoming? We think Reality or God is to be reached through time, through becoming. We think that life is an endless ladder for us to climb ever to greater and greater heights. Our thinking-feeling is caught in the horizontal process of becoming; the becomer is ever accumulating, ever gaining, ever expanding. The self, the becomer, the creator of time, can never experience the Timeless. The self, the becomer, is the cause of conflict and sorrow.

Does becoming lead to being? Through time can there be the Timeless? Through conflict can there be tranquillity? Through war, hate, can there be love? Only when becoming ceases is there being; through the horizontal process of time the Eternal is not; conflict does not lead to tranquillity; hate cannot be changed to love. The becomer can never be tranquil. Craving can never lead to that which is beyond and above all craving. The chain of sorrow is broken only when the becomer ceases to become, positively or negatively.

Now the becomer desires to translate his becoming into being. He sees perhaps the futility of becoming and desires to transform that process into being; instead of becoming, now he must be. He sees the pain of greed and now he desires to transform greed into non-greed which is still a becoming; he has assumed a new attitude, a new garb called non-greed; but still the becomer continues to become. Does not this desire to translate the becoming into being lead to illusion? The becomer perhaps now perceives the endless conflict and sorrow involved in becoming and so craves a different state which he calls being; but craving continues under a new name. The ways of becoming are very subtle and till the becomer is aware of them he will continue to become, to be in conflict and sorrow. By changing terms we think we understand and how easily we pacify ourselves!

Being is only when there is no effort, positive or negative, to become; only when the becomer is self-aware and understands the

enchaining sorrow and wasted effort of becoming and no longer uses will, then only can he be silent. His desire and his will have subsided; then only is there the tranquillity of supreme wisdom. To become non-greedy is one thing and being without greed is another; to become implies a process but being does not. Process implies time; the state of being is not a result, not a product of education, discipline, conditioning. You cannot transform noise into silence; silence can only come into being when noise ceases. Result is a time process, a determined end through a determined means; but through a process, through time, the Timeless is not. Self-awareness and right meditation will reveal the process of becoming. Meditation is not the cultivation of the becomeer but through self-knowledge the meditator, the becomeer ceases.

Questioner: If we only consider the obvious meaning of your words, memory constitutes one of the mechanisms against which you have warned time and again. And yet you yourself, for instance, sometimes use written notes to aid your memory in reconstructing the introductory remarks which you obviously have thought out previously. Does there exist one necessary and even indispensable kind of memory related to the outside world of facts and figures, and an entirely different kind of memory which might be called psychological memory, which is detrimental because it interferes with the creative attitude which you have hinted at in expressions like "lying fallow"—"dying each day" etc?

Krishnamurti: Memory is accumulated experience and what is accumulated is the known and what is known is ever the past. With the burden of the known can that which is Timeless be discovered? Is not freedom from the past necessary to experience that which is Immeasurable? That which is made up, that is, memory, cannot comprehend that which is not. Wisdom is not accumulated memory but is supreme vulnerability to the Real.

Should we not, as the questioner points out, be aware of the two kinds of memories: the indispensable, relating to facts and figures, and the psychological memory? Without this indispensable memory we could not communicate with each other. We accumulate and cling to psychological memories and so give continuity to the self; thus the self, the past, is ever increasing, ever adding to itself. It is this accumulating memory, the self, that must come to an end; as long as thought-feeling is identifying itself with the memories of yesterday it will be ever in conflict and sorrow; as long as thought-feeling is ever becoming it cannot experience the bliss of the Real. That which is Real is not the continuation of identifying memory. According to what has been stored up one experiences; according to one's conditioning and psychological memories and tendencies are

the experiences, but such experiences are ever enclosing, limiting. It is to this accumulation that one must die.

Is the experience of the Real based on memory, on accumulation? Is it not possible for thought-feeling to go above and beyond these interrelated layers of memory? Continuance is memory and is it possible for this memory to cease and a new state come into being? Can the educated and conditioned consciousness comprehend that which is not a result? It cannot and so it must die to itself. Psychological memory, ever striving to become, is creating results, barriers, and so is ever enslaving itself. It is to this becoming that thought-feeling must die; only through constant self-awareness does this self-identifying memory come to an end; it cannot come to an end through an act of will for will is craving and craving is the accumulation of identifying memory.

Truth is not to be formulated nor can it be discovered through any formulation or any belief; only when there is freedom from becoming, from self-identifying memory, does it come into being. Our thought is the result of the past and without understanding its conditioning it cannot go beyond itself. Thought-feeling becomes a slave to its own creation, to its own power of illusion if it is unaware of its own ways. Only when thought ceases to formulate can there be creation.

Questioner: Do not the images of saints, Masters, help us to meditate rightly?

Krishnamurti: If you would go north why look towards the south? If you would be free why become slaves? Must you know sobriety through drunkenness? Must you have tyranny to know freedom?

As meditation is of the highest importance we ought to approach it rightly from the very beginning. Right means create right ends; the end is in the means. Wrong means produce wrong ends and at no time will wrong means bring about right ends. By killing another will you bring about tolerance and compassion? Only right meditation can bring about right understanding. It is essential for the meditator to understand himself, not the objects of his meditation, for the meditator and his meditation are one, not separate. Without understanding oneself meditation becomes a process of self-hypnosis inducing experiences according to one's conditioning, one's belief. The dreamer must understand himself, not his dreams; he must awaken and put an end to them. If the meditator is seeking an end, a result, then he will hypnotize himself by his desire. Meditation is often a self-hypnotic process; it may produce certain desired results but such meditation does not bring enlightenment.

The questioner wants to know if examples help one to meditate rightly. They may help to concentrate, to focus attention, but such

concentration is not meditation. Mere concentration though troublesome is comparatively easy, but what then? The concentrator is still what he is, only he has acquired a new faculty, a new means through which he can function, enjoy and do harm. Of what value is concentration if he who concentrates is lustful, worldly and stupid? He will still do harm; he will still create enmity and confusion. Mere concentration narrows the mind-heart which only strengthens its conditioning, thus causing credulity and obstinacy. Before you learn to concentrate, understand the structure of your whole being, not just one part of it. With self-awareness there comes self-knowledge, right thinking. This self-awareness or understanding creates its own discipline and concentration; such pliable discipline is enduring, effective, not the self-imposed discipline of greed and envy. Understanding ever widens and deepens into extensional awareness; this awareness is essential for right meditation. Meditation of the heart is understanding.

We use examples as a means of inspiration. Why do we seek inspiration? As our lives are empty, dull and mechanical we seek inspiration outside of ourselves. The Master, the saint, the savior then becomes a necessity, a necessity which enslaves us. Being enslaved you then have to free yourself from your enchantment to discover the Real, for the Real can only be experienced in freedom.

Because you are *not* interested in self-knowledge you seek from others inspiration which is another form of distraction. Self-knowledge is a process of creative discovery which is hindered when thought-feeling is concerned with gain. Greed for a result prevents the flowering of self-knowledge. Search itself is devotion, it is in itself inspiration. A mind that is identifying, comparing, judging, soon wearies and needs distraction, so-called inspiration. All distraction, noble or otherwise, is idolatrous.

But if the meditator begins to understand himself then his meditation has great significance. Through self-awareness and self-knowledge there comes right thinking; only then can thought go above and beyond the conditioned layers of consciousness. Meditation then is being, which has its own eternal movement; it is creation itself for the meditator has ceased to be.

OAK GROVE TALKS, OJAI, 1946

Though this is not a small group we will try to have a free and serious discussion instead of turning these gatherings into question and answer meetings. Some no doubt would prefer uninterrupted talks but it seems to me to be more advantageous for all of us to join in a purposeful discussion which requires earnestness and sustained interest.

For what are we striving? What is it that each one is seeking? Till we are aware of our separate pursuits it is not possible to establish right relationship between us. One might be seeking fulfillment and success, another wealth and power, another fame and popularity; some may wish to accumulate and some to renounce; there might be some who are earnestly seeking to dissolve the ego while others may wish merely to talk about it. Is it not important for us to find out what it is we are seeking? To extricate ourselves from the confusion and misery in and about us we must be aware of our instinctive and cultivated desires and tendencies. We think and feel in terms of achievement, of gain and loss, and so there is constant strife; but there is a way of living, a state of being, in which conflict and sorrow have no place.

So to make these discussions fruitful it is necessary, is it not, first to understand our own intentions? When we observe what is taking place in our lives and in the world we perceive that most of us, in subtle or crude ways, are occupied with the expansion of the self. We crave self-expansion now or in the future; for us life is a process of the continuous expansion of the ego through power, wealth, asceticism or the cultivation of virtue and so on. Not only for the individual but for the group, for the nation this process signifies fulfilling, becoming, growing and has ever led to great disasters and miseries. We are ever striving within the framework of the self, however much it may be enlarged and glorified. If this be your aim and mine wholly different then we will have no relationship though we may meet; then our discussions will be purposeless and confused. So first we must be very clear in our intention. We must be clear and definite as to what we are seeking. Are we craving self-expansion, the constant nourishment of the ego, the me and the mine, or are we seeking to understand and so transcend the process of the self? Will self-expansion bring about understanding, enlightenment; or is there illumination, liberation only when the process of self-expansion has ceased? Can we reveal ourselves sufficiently to discern in which direction our interest lies? You must have come here with serious intent; therefore we will discuss in order to clarify that intent, and consider if our daily life indicates what our pursuits are and whether

we are nourishing the ego or not. So these discussions can be a means of self-exposure to each one of us. In this self-exposure we will discover the true significance of life.

Must we not first have freedom to discover? There can be no freedom if our action is ever enclosing. Is not the action of the ego, the sense of the me and the mine, ever a process of limitation? We are trying to find out, are we not, if the process of self-expansion leads to Reality or if Reality comes into being only when the self ceases?

Questioner: Must one not go through the self-expansive process in order to realize the Immeasurable?

Krishnamurti: May I put the same question differently? Must one go through drunkenness to know sobriety? Must one go through the various states of craving only to renounce them?

Questioner: Can one do anything with regard to this self-expansive process?

Krishnamurti: May I elaborate this question? We are, are we not, positively encouraging through many actions the expansion of the ego? Our tradition, our education, our social conditioning sustain positively the activities of the ego. This positive activity may take a negative form—not to be something. So our action is still a positive or negative activity of the self. Through centuries of tradition and education thought accepts as natural and inevitable the self-expansive life, positively or negatively. How can thought free itself from this conditioning? How can it be tranquil, silent? If there is that stillness, that is, if it is not caught in self-expansive processes, then there is Reality.

Questioner: If I rightly understand, surely you are reaching way out into the abstract, are you not? You are speaking about reincarnation, I presume?

Krishnamurti: I am not, sir, nor am I reaching out into the abstract. Our social and religious structure is based on the urge to become something, positively or negatively. Such a process is the very nourishment of the ego, through name, family, achievement, through identification of the me and mine which is ever causing conflict and sorrow. We perceive the results of this way of life: strife, confusion and antagonism, ever spreading, ever engulfing. How is one to transcend strife and sorrow? This is what we are attempting to understand during these discussions.

Is not craving the very root of the self? How is thought which has become the means of self-expansion to act without giving sustenance to the ego, the cause of conflict and sorrow? Is this not an important question? Do not let me *make* it important to you. Is

this not a vital question to each one? If it is, must we not find the true answer? We are nourishing the ego in many ways and before we condemn or encourage we must understand its significance, must we not? We use religion and philosophy as a means of self-expansion; our social structure is based on the aggrandizement of the self; the clerk will become the manager and later the owner, the pupil will become the Master and so on. In this process there is ever conflict, antagonism, sorrow. Is this an intelligent and inevitable process? We can discover Truth for ourselves only when we do not depend on another; no specialist can give us the right answer. Each one has to find the right answer directly for himself. For this reason it is important to be earnest.

We vary in our earnestness according to circumstances, our moods and fancies. Earnestness must be independent of circumstances and moods, of persuasion and hope. We often think that perhaps through shock we shall be made earnest but dependence is never productive of earnestness. Earnestness comes into being with inquiring awareness and are we so alertly aware? If you are aware you will realize that your mind is constantly engaged in the activities of the ego and its identification; if you pursue this activity further you will find the deep seated self-interest. These thoughts of self-interest arise from the needs of daily life, things you do from moment to moment, your role in society and so on, all of which build up the structure of the ego. This seems so strangely inevitable but before we accept this inevitability must we not be aware of our purposive intention, whether we desire to nourish the ego or not? For according to our hidden intentions we will act. We know how the self is built up and strengthened through the pleasure and pain principle, through memory, through identification and so on. This process is the cause of conflict and sorrow. Do we earnestly seek to put an end to the cause of sorrow?

Questioner: How do we know our intention is right before we understand the truth of the matter? If we do not first comprehend truth then we shall go off the beam, founding communities, forming groups, having half-baked ideas. Is it not necessary, as you have suggested, to know oneself first? I have tried to write down my thoughts-feelings as has been suggested but I find myself blocked and unable to follow my thoughts right through.

Krishnamurti: Through being choicelessly aware of your intentions the truth of the matter is known. We are often blocked because unconsciously we are afraid to take action which might lead to further trouble and suffering. But no clear and definite action can take place if we have not uncovered our deep and hidden intention with regard to nourishing and maintaining the self.

Is not this fear which hinders understanding the result of projection, speculation? You imagine that freedom from self-expansion is a state of nothingness, an emptiness and this creates fear, thus preventing any actual experience. Through speculation, through imagination you prevent the discovery of what is. As the self is in constant flux we seek, through identification, permanency. Identification brings about the illusion of permanency and it is the loss of this which causes fear. We recognize that the self is in constant flux yet we cling to something which we call the permanent in the self, an enduring self which we fabricate out of the impermanent self. If we deeply experienced and understood that the self is ever impermanent then there would be no identification with any particular form of craving, with any particular country, nation or with any organized system of thought or religion, for with identification comes the horror of war, the ruthlessness of so-called civilization.

Questioner: Is the fact of this constant flux not enough to make us identify? It seems to me that we cling to something called the me, the self, for it is a pleasant habit of sound. We know a river even when it is dry; similarly we cling to something that is me, even though we know its impermanency. The me is shallow or deep, in full flood or dry, but it is always the me to be encouraged, nourished, maintained at any cost. Why must the I process be eliminated?

Krishnamurti: Now why do you ask this question? If the process is pleasurable you will continue in it and not ask such a question; when it is disagreeable, painful, then only will you desire to put an end to it. According to pleasure and pain thought is shaped, controlled, guided and upon such a weak, changing foundation we make an attempt to understand Truth! Whether the self should be maintained or not is a very vital issue for on it depends the whole course of our action, and so how we approach this problem is all important. On our approach depends the answer. If we are not earnest then the answer will be according to our prejudices and passing fancies. So the approach matters more than the problem itself. Upon the seeker depends what he finds; if he is prejudiced, limited, then he will find according to his conditioning. What then is important is for the seeker first to understand himself.

Questioner: How do we know if there is an abstract truth?

Krishnamurti: Surely, sir, we are not considering now an abstract truth. We are attempting to discover the true and lasting answer to our problem of sorrow, for on that depends the whole course of life.

Questioner: Can the conditioned mind observe its conditioning?

Krishnamurti: Is it not possible to be aware of our prejudices? Cannot we know when we are dishonest, when we are intolerant, when we are greedy?

Questioner: Is not the nourishment of the body equally wrong?

Krishnamurti: We are considering the psychological nourishment, the expansion of the self, which causes such strife and misery. One can accept the activity of the self as inevitable and follow that course or there may be another way of life. If it is an intense problem to each one of us then we shall find the right answer.

Questioner: Shall we not know the true answer when the desire for it is greater than for any other thing?

Questioner: Is the ego always harmful? Is selfishness ever beneficial?

Krishnamurti: Self-centered attention and activity, positively or negatively, is the cause of strife and pain. How seriously is each one considering this problem? How earnest are we about discovering the truth of the nature and activity of the ego, the self? Our meditation and spiritual discipline have no meaning if first we are not clear upon this point. True meditation is not self-expansion in any form. So till we can have a common understanding of our purpose there will be confusion, and right relationship between us will not be possible.

Questioner: Is there not a way straight to the problem, to find out the truth?

Krishnamurti: There is, but this demands utter stillness, open receptivity. This requires right understanding; otherwise effort to be open, to be tranquil becomes another means of self-expansion. I am saying that there is a different way of life, a way that is not of self-expansion, in which there is ecstasy, but it has no validity if you merely accept my statement; such acceptance will become another form of egotistic activity. You must know for yourself, directly, the truth of yourself and you cannot realize it through another, however great. There is no authority that can reveal it. Truth can be uncovered only through your own understanding and understanding comes only through self-knowledge. We have a common problem to which we are trying to find the right answer.

Questioner: Writing a book could be a self-expansive action, could it not?

Questioner: Should we not establish a purpose in our lives?

Krishnamurti: The ego can choose a noble purpose and so utilize it as a means for its own expansion.

Questioner: If there is no self-expansion is there a purpose, as we know it now?

Krishnamurti: A man who is asleep dreams that he has a purpose or must choose a purpose but does he who is awake have a purpose? He is simply awake. Our frames of reference, our purposes are a means, negatively or positively, of measuring the growth of the self.

Questioner: Is fulfillment self-expansion?

Krishnamurti: If fulfillment is prevented is there not the pain of frustration of the self? Questions of similar kind will find their answer in discovering the truth concerning the self-expansive process; this depends on earnestness and on the open receptivity of the mind-heart.

Questioner: Must we not know what is the other way of life before we can relinquish self-aggrandizement?

Krishnamurti: How can we know or be aware of another way of life till we can perceive the falseness, the futility of acquisition and self-expansion? In understanding the ways of self-aggrandizement we shall become aware. To speculate about the way becomes a hindrance to the very understanding of that life which is not one of self-perpetuation. So must we not discover the truth concerning the habitual activities of the self? It is knowledge of the hindrance that is the liberating factor, not the attempt to be free from the hindrance. Effort made to be free without the liberating action of Truth is still within the enclosing walls of the self. You can discover Truth only if you are willing to give your whole mind and heart to it, not a few moments of your easily spared time. If we are earnest we will find Truth; but this earnestness cannot depend on stimulation of any kind. We must give our full and deep attention to the discovery of the truth of our problem, not for a few grudging moments but constantly. It is Truth alone that liberates thought from its own enclosing process.

We have been saying there can be no right relationship between us if we do not understand each other's intentions. The way of self-expansion is the way of strife and sorrow and is not the way of Reality. The ecstasy of Reality is to be found through awakened, highest intelligence. Intelligence is not the cultivation of memory or reason but an awareness in which identification and choice have ceased.

To think out a thought fully is difficult for it needs patience and extensional awareness. We have been educated in a way of life which furthers the self, through achievement, through identification, through organized religion; this way of thought and action has led us to fearful catastrophes and untold misery

Questioner: You have said that illumination could never come through self-expansion but does it not come through the expansion of consciousness?

Krishnamurti: Illumination, understanding of the Real, can never come through the expansion of the self, through the I making an effort to grow, to become, to achieve and there is no effort apart from the will of the I. How can there be understanding if the self is ever filtering experience, identifying, accumulating memory? Consciousness is the product of the mind and the mind is the result of conditioning, of craving, and so it is the seat of the self. Only when the activity of the self, of memory, ceases is there a wholly different consciousness, about which any speculation is a hindrance. The effort to expand is still the activity of the self whose consciousness is to grow, to become. Such consciousness however expanded is time-binding and so the Timeless is not.

If one desires to understand a vital problem should not one put aside one's tendencies, prejudices, fears and hopes, one's conditioning, and be aware simply and directly? In thinking over our problems together we are exposing ourselves to ourselves. This self-exposure is of great importance for it will reveal to us the process of our own thoughts-feelings. We have to dig deeply into ourselves to find truth. We are conditioned and is it possible for thought to go beyond its own limitation? It is possible only through being aware of our conditioning. We have developed a certain kind of intelligence in the process of self-expansion; through greed, through acquisitiveness, through conflict and pain we have developed a self-protective, self-expansive intelligence. Can this intelligence comprehend the Real which alone can resolve all our problems?

Questioner: Is intelligence the right word to use?

Krishnamurti: If we all understand the meaning of that term as I am using it here, it is applicable. The main point is, can this intelligence which has been cultivated through the expansion of the self experience or discover truth; or must there be another kind of activity, another kind of awareness to receive truth? To discover truth there must be freedom from the self-expansive intelligence for it is ever enclosing, ever limiting.

Questioner: Must we not look at this problem of self-expansion from the point of view of what is true?

Krishnamurti: To see the false as the false and the true as the true is difficult. If you saw the truth about self-expansion then its problems would begin to fade away. To see the truth in the false is to understand yourself first. It is the truth in the false that is liberating.

Questioner: Do you imply that there is a greater intelligence than ours?

Krishnamurti: We are not trying to discover whether there is a greater intelligence but what we are considering is whether the particular intelligence we have so sedulously cultivated can experience or understand Reality.

Questioner: Is there a Reality?

Krishnamurti: To discover that, there must be a tranquil mind, a mind that is not fabricating thoughts, images, hopes. As the mind is ever seeking to expand through its own creations it cannot experience Reality. If the mind, the instrument, is blurred, it is of little use in the search of truth. It must first cleanse itself and then only will it be possible to know if there is Reality. So each one must be aware, recognize the state of his intelligence. By its very limitation is not the mind a hindrance to the discovery of the Real? Before thought can free itself it first must recognize its own limitations.

Questioner: Can you tell us how to go through this process without impairing ourselves?

Krishnamurti: I am afraid we are talking at cross purposes and so we are getting confused. What is it that each one of us is seeking? Are we not aware of a common search?

Questioner: I am trying to solve my problem. I am seeking God. I want love. I want security.

Krishnamurti: Are we not all seeking to transcend conflict and sorrow? Conflict and sorrow come to us in different ways but the cause common to us all is self-expansion. The cause of conflict and sorrow is craving, the self. Through understanding and so dissolving the cause our psychological problems will come to an end.

Questioner: Will the solution of the central problem end for me all problems?

Krishnamurti: Only if you dissolve the cause of all problems, the self; till then each day brings new strife and pain.

Questioner: My intelligence says that by solving my individual problem I can fit harmoniously into the whole. Are there different purposes for each one of us?

Krishnamurti: Out of our self-contradiction and confusion have we not invented purposes according to our tendencies and desires? Are not our purposes and problems fabricated by the self?

Being in sorrow we seek to be happy. If this is our chief concern, as it surely is for most of us, then we must know what the causes are that prevent us from being happy, or that make us sorrowful.

Questioner: How am I to eradicate the causes?

Krishnamurti: Before you put that question you must be aware of the causes of sorrow. Being in sorrow you say you are seeking happiness; so the search for happiness is an escape from sorrow. There can be happiness only when the cause of sorrow ceases; so happiness is a by-product and not an end in itself. The cause of sorrow is the self with its craving to expand, to become, to be other than what it is; with its craving for sensation, for power, for happiness and so on.

Questioner: If there were no discontent there would be no progress, there would be stagnation.

Krishnamurti: You want both "progress" and happiness and that is your difficulty, is it not? You desire self-expansion but not the conflict and sorrow that inevitably come with it. We are afraid to look at ourselves as we are, we want to run away from the actual and this flight we call "progress" or the search for happiness. We say that we will decay if we do not "progress"; we will become lazy, thoughtless, if we do not struggle to run away from what is. Our education and the world that we have created help us to run away; yet to be happy we must know the cause of sorrow. To know the cause of sorrow and transcend it is to face it, not to seek escape

through illusory ideals or through further activities of the self. The cause of sorrow is the activity of the expanding self. Even to crave to be rid of the self is negative action of the self and hence delusive.

Questioner: Could we take a positive rather than a negative point of view, saying to ourselves that we are the whole?

Krishnamurti: Is not a positive or negative action of the self still the movement of the self? If the self asserts that it is the whole is not that an activity of the self seeking to enclose the whole within its own walls? We think that by constantly asserting we are the whole, we will become the whole; such repetition is self-hypnosis and to be drugged is not to be illumined. We are not yet aware of the cunning deceptions of our minds, of the subtle ways of the self. Without self-knowledge there can be no happiness, no wisdom.

Questioner: I do not desire self-expansion.

Krishnamurti: Can it be so easily thought and said? The desire for self-expansion is complex and subtle. The structure of our thought is based on this expansion, to grow, to become, to fulfill.

Questioner: The cause of sorrow is incompleteness. Expansion stimulates and so we crave for it.

Krishnamurti: Can we not experience here and now directly for ourselves the cause of sorrow? If we can experience and understand this urge to expand, to be, then we shall go beyond the verbal state to the root of sorrow.

Questioner: I want to find truth and that is one of my reasons for self-expansion.

Krishnamurti: Why are you seeking truth? Do you seek it because you are unhappy and so through its discovery you hope to be happy? Truth is not compensation; it is not a reward for your suffering, for your struggles. Do you hope that it will set you free? The activity of the self is ever binding and does not lead to truth. Without self-awareness and self-knowledge how can there be the understanding of truth? We think we are seeking truth; but perhaps we are only seeking gratifying remedies, comforting answers. We verbally assert the need for brotherhood, for unity, without eradicating in ourselves the causes of conflict and antagonism. We must be aware of the cause of self-expansion and directly experience its full implications.

Questioner: Self-expansion is a natural instinct and what is wrong with it?

Questioner: We want to be loved and if we are frustrated we seek another form of gratification. We are continually seeking satisfaction.

Krishnamurti: The seemingly natural instinct for self-expansion is the cause of discontent and pain; it is the cause of our recurrent disasters, civilized ruthlessness and mounting misery. It may be "natural" but surely it must be transcended for the Timeless to be. The craving for gratification is without end.

Questioner: Why is there the urge to be superior?

Questioner: I do not know why but there is in me the urge to be superior. I cannot observe it without being amused or appalled, yet I want to be superior. I know it is wrong to feel superior. It leads to misery, it is anti-social, it is immoral.

Krishnamurti: You are merely condemning the desire to be superior; you are not trying to understand it. To condemn or accept is to create resistance which hinders understanding. Do not all of us desire to be superior in some way or another? If we deny it, we condemn it or are blind to it we shall not understand the causes that sustain this desire.

Questioner: I want to be superior because I want to be loved by people for it is necessary to be loved.

Krishnamurti: Being inferior there is the urge to feel superior; not being loved we desire to be loved. That is, in myself I am insignificant, empty, shallow, so I desire to put on masks for different occasions, the mask of superiority and of nobility, the mask of earnestness, the mask that asserts it is seeking God and so on. Being inwardly poor we desire to identify ourselves with the great, with the nation, with the Master, with an ideology and so on, the form of identification varying with circumstances and moods.

You may pursue virtue and practise spiritual exercises but by covering up this incompleteness, in denying it consciously or unconsciously, it is not transcended. Till it is transcended all activity of the self which is the cause of conflict and sorrow. Being inwardly insufficient we have developed the cunning art of escape; this escape we call by various pleasant sounding names. How can this process of the mind comprehend the Real? How can it comprehend something not of its own fabrication?

The desire to be superior, to become the Master, to accumulate knowledge, to lose oneself in activities offers hopeful and gratifying escape from inward poverty, insufficiency. Being incomplete, empty,

any activity, however noble, can only be the expansive movement of the self.

Questioner: Can we not occasionally realize that we are escaping?

Krishnamurti: We may, but our self-expansive urge is so cunning, subtle, that it avoids coming directly in conflict with this aching insufficiency. How to approach this problem is our difficulty, is it not?

Questioner: When you are free what is the purpose of activity?

Krishnamurti: How can mind that is the outcome of insufficiency and fear experience an activity which is not of the self? How can a mind that is acquisitive and fearful, bound by dogma and belief, experience Reality? It cannot. Speculation of what is beyond its limitation is only a postponement of the realization of its bondage. If I may suggest, can we try during the coming week to be aware of this bondage that has been developed by the process of self-expansion, for this limitation, this expanding self can never experience or discover the Real?

III

Without the experience of the Real there can never be freedom from conflict and sorrow; the Real alone can transform our life, not mere resolution. All activity of the self with its resolutions and negations must cease for the Real to be. To understand the activities of the self there must be earnest endeavor, sustained alertness and interest. Many of us hold to our beliefs or to our experiences and this only breeds obstinacy. Earnestness is not dependent on moods, on circumstances nor on stimulation. Some who are attempting to live an earnest life are strenuous along some particular groove of thought, belief or discipline and thus become intolerant and rigid. Such strenuous effort prevents deep understanding and closes the door upon Reality. If you will consider this closely you will see that what is necessary is natural effortless discernment, the freedom to discover and understand. These ideas, if allowed, will take root and

bring about a radical transformation of our daily life. The unforced receptivity is much more significant than the effort made to understand.

Questioner: I am afraid it is not very clear.

Krishnamurti: Most of us here are making an effort to understand; such effort is the activity of will which only creates resistance and resistance is not overcome by another resistance, by another act of will; such effort actually prevents understanding; whereas if we were alertly pliable and aware we would understand deeply. All effort we now make issues from the desire for self-expansion; only when there is an effortless awareness can there be discovery and understanding, a perception of the true.

When we see a painting we first want to know who the painter is, we then compare and criticize it, or try to interpret it according to our conditioning. We do not really see the picture or the scenery but are only concerned with our clever capacity for interpretation, criticism or admiration; we are generally so full of ourselves that we do not really see the picture or the scenery. If we could banish our judgment and clever analysis then perhaps the picture might convey its significance. Similarly these discussions will have meaning only if we are open to the experience of discovery which is prevented by our clinging obstinately to beliefs, memories and conditioned prejudices.

Questioner: Is there anything that one can do to be passively aware? Can I do anything to be open?

Krishnamurti: The very desire to be open can be an effort of the self which only creates resistance. We can but be aware that we are enclosed, that the activity of will is resistance and that the very desire itself to gain passive awareness is another hindrance. To make a positive effort to be open is to throw up the barrier of greed. To be aware of the self-enclosing activities is to break them down; to be unaware and yet desire to be open is to create further resistance. Passive awareness comes only when the mind-heart is tranquil. In this stillness the Real comes into being. This stillness is not to be induced nor is it the outcome of the activity of will. An intelligence which is the product of desire, of self-expansion, is ever creating resistance and it can never bring about tranquillity. Such intelligence of self-protectiveness is the product of time, of the impermanent, and so can never experience the Timeless.

Questioner: Is not this intelligence useful in other ways?

Krishnamurti: Its only use is in protecting itself which has caused untold misery and pain.

Questioner: From the amoeba to man the intelligence to be secure, to self-expand is inevitable and natural; it is a closed and vicious circle.

Krishnamurti: That may seem so but the activity to be secure has not led man to security, to happiness, to wisdom. It has led him to ever increasing confusion, conflict and misery. There is a different activity which is not of the self, which must be sought out. A different intelligence is needed to experience the Timeless, which alone will free us from incessant strife and sorrow. The intelligence that we now possess is the result of craving gratification, security, in crude or subtle form; it is the result of greed; it is the outcome of self-identification. Such an intelligence can never experience the Real.

Questioner: Do you say that intelligence and self-consciousness are synonymous?

Krishnamurti: Consciousness is the outcome of identified continuity. Sensation, feeling, rationalization and the continuity of identified memory make up self-consciousness, do they not? Can we say precisely where consciousness ends and intelligence begins? They flow into each other, do they not? Is there consciousness without intelligence?

Questioner: Does a new intelligence come into being if we are aware of the self-expansive intelligence?

Krishnamurti: We shall know, as experience, the new form of intelligence only when the self-protective and self-expansive intelligence ceases.

Questioner: How can we go beyond this limited intelligence?

Krishnamurti: Through being passively aware of its complex and interrelated activities. In so being aware the causes that nourish the intelligence of the self come to an end without self-conscious effort.

Questioner: How can one cultivate the other intelligence?

Krishnamurti: Is not that a wrong question? I wonder if we are paying interested attention to what is being said. The wrong cannot cultivate the right. We are still thinking in terms of self-expanding intelligence and that is our difficulty. We are unaware of it and so we ask, without thought, how can the other intelligence be cultivated? Surely there are certain obvious, essential require-

ments which will free the mind from this limited intelligence; humility which is related to humor and mercy; to be without greed which is to be without identification; to be unworldly which is to be free from sensate values; to be free from stupidity, from ignorance which is the lack of self-knowledge, and so on. We must be aware of the cunning and devious ways of the self, and in understanding them virtue comes into being, but virtue is not an end in itself. Self-interest cannot cultivate virtue, it can only perpetuate itself under the mask of virtue; under the cover of virtue there is still the activity of the self. It is as though we were attempting to see the clear, pure light through colored glasses, which we are unaware of wearing. To see the pure light we must first be aware of our colored glasses; this very awareness, if the urge to see the pure light is strong, helps to remove the colored glasses. This removal is not the action of one resistance against another but is an effortless action of understanding. We must be aware of the actual and the understanding of what is will set thought free; this very understanding will bring about open receptivity, transcending the particular intelligence.

Questioner: How does the intelligence with which we are all familiar come into being?

Krishnamurti: It comes into being through perception, sensation, contact, desire, identification, all of which give continuity to the self through memory. The principle of pleasure, pain, identification is ever sustaining this intelligence which can never open the door to Truth.

Questioner: We do have to make some kind of effort, do we not?

Krishnamurti: The effort that we now make is an activity of the expansion of the self with its particular intelligence. This effort can only strengthen, positively or negatively, the self-protective intelligence or resistance. This intelligence can never experience the Real which alone brings liberation from our conflict, confusion and sorrow.

Questioner: How has this intelligence come into being?

Krishnamurti: Has it not been cultivated through specialization? Has it not come into being through imitation, through conditioning? The cultivation of the me and the mine is specialization; the me that is special, all important: my work, my action, my success, my virtue, my country, my savior; this positive and negative striving to become implies specialization. Specialization is death, the lack of infinite pliability.

Questioner: I see that but what am I to do?

Krishnamurti: Be aware, without choice, of this process of specialization and you will discover that a deep revolutionary change is taking place within you. Do not say to yourself that you are going to be aware, or that awareness has to be cultivated, or that it is a matter of growth or craftsmanship, which is an indication of postponement, laziness. You are or you are not aware. Be aware now of this specializing process.

Questioner: All this implies extensive self-study and self-knowledge, does it not?

Krishnamurti: And that is the very thing we are attempting here; we are exposing to ourselves the ways of our thought-feeling, its cunning, its subtlety, its pride in its so-called intelligence and so on. This is not book knowledge but actual experience, from moment to moment, in the ways of the self. Thus we are trying to uncover the ways of the self. The desire to expand in the world or to pursue virtue is still the activity of the self; the urge to become, negatively or positively, is the factor in specialization. This desire which prevents infinite pliability must be understood through awareness of the specializing process of the me.

Questioner: If I am just pliable can't I go wrong and therefore must I not be anchored in truth?

* Krishnamurti: Truth is discovered in the uncharted sea of self-knowledge. But why do you ask this question? Is it not because you are frightened lest you go astray? Does it not imply that you crave to achieve, to succeed, to be ever in the right? We crave security and this craving prevents the freedom of Truth. Those who are deep in self-knowledge are pliable. We see that one of the causes of resistance is specialization; and another is imitation. The desire to copy is complex and subtle. The structure of our thought is based on imitation, religious or worldly. Newspapers, radios, magazines, books, education, governments, organized religions, all these and other factors help to make thought conform. Also each one desires to conform; for it is easier to conform than to be aware. Conformity is the basis of our social existence and we are afraid to be alone. Fear and thoughtlessness bring about acceptance and conformity, the acceptance of authority. As with the individual so with the group, with the nation.

Conformity is one of the many means through which the self maintains itself. Thought moves from the known to the known, ever fearful of the unknown, of the uncertain, and yet only when there is uncertainty, when the mind is not in the bondage of the known is

there the ecstasy of the Real. Thought must be alone for the comprehension of the Real. Through self-knowledge the imitative process comes to an end.

Questioner: Must we always face the unknown?

Krishnamurti: The Eternal is ever the unknown for a mind that accumulates; what is accumulated is memory and memory is ever the past, the time-binder. That which is the result of time cannot experience the Timeless, the Unknown.

We shall always be faced with the unknown till we understand the knowable, which is ourselves. This understanding cannot be given to you by the specialist, the psychologist or the priest; you must seek it for yourself, in yourself, through self-awareness. Memory, the past, is shaping the present according to the pattern of pleasure and pain. Memory becomes the guide, the path towards safety, security; it is this identifying memory that gives continuity to the self.

The search for self-knowledge demands constant alertness, an awareness without choice which is difficult and arduous.

Questioner: Are we worms which must turn into butterflies?

Krishnamurti: Again how easily we slip into ignorant ways of thinking! Being evil we will eventually become good; being mortal we will become immortal. With these comforting thoughts we drug ourselves. Evil can never become good; hate can never become love; greed can never become non-greed. Hate must be abandoned, it cannot be changed into something which it is not. Through growth, through time evil cannot become good. Time does not make the ignoble noble. We must be aware of this ignorance and its illusions. We are educated to think that the conflict of the opposites produces a hoped-for result, but this is not so. An opposite is the outcome of resistance and resistance is not overcome by opposition. Each resistance must be dissolved not by its opposite but through understanding the resistance itself.

Conflict exists between various desires, not between light and darkness. There can never be struggle between light and darkness for where there is light darkness is not, where there is truth the false is not. When the self divides itself into the higher and the lower, this very contradiction begets conflict, confusion and antagonism. To be aware of what is and not escape into fanciful illusion is the beginning of understanding. We should be concerned with what is, the craving for self-expansion, and not try to transform it, for the transformer is still craving which is the action of the self; the very awareness of what is brings about understanding. To be aware from moment to

moment brings its own clarification. The desire for achievement and recognition prevents awakening; the sleeper dreams, that he must awaken and struggles in his dream but it is only a dream. The sleeper cannot awaken through dreams; he must cease sleeping. Thought itself must be aware of creating the structure of the self and its perpetuation. One who is earnest must discover for himself the truth about self-perpetuation.

Questioner: What is there to prove that the perpetuation of the self is in itself bad?

Krishnamurti: Nothing at all, if we are satisfied with it and unaware of the issues of life, but we are all in comparative strife and sorrow. Some cover up their pains or escape from them. They have not resolved their confusion and misery.

Realizing our state of self-contradiction and its painful conflicts we want to find the right way of transcending it; for in incompleteness there is no peace. Is it not the very nature of the self, at all times, to be contradictory? This contradiction breeds conflict, confusion and enmity. Craving, the very basis of the self, is ever unfulfilled; in trying to overcome incompleteness man is ever in conflict within and without. Those who are in earnest must discover for themselves the truth about incompleteness. This discovery does not depend on any authority or formula nor on the acquisition of knowledge. To discover truth we must be passively aware. Since we are afraid and enclosed we must be aware of the causes that create resistance, of the desire for self-perpetuation which creates conflict.

Questioner: What happens to that self-perpetuating intelligence when a soldier in battle throws himself in front of a gun to save another?

Krishnamurti: Probably at the moment of great tension the soldier forgets himself but is that a recommendation for war?

Questioner: Do we not hear that war brings out noble, self-sacrificing qualities?

Krishnamurti: Through a wrong act, the killing of another, can a right worthy end be realized?

Questioner: Is not self-knowledge a difficult pursuit?

Krishnamurti: It is and yet it is not. It demands effortless discernment, sensitive receptivity. Constant alertness is arduous because we are lazy; we would rather gain through others, through much reading, but information is not self-knowledge. In the mean-

while we continue with greed, wars and the vain repetition of rituals. All this indicates, does it not, the desire to run away from the real problem which is you and your inner insufficiency? Without understanding yourself mere outward activity, however worthy and satisfying, only leads to further confusion and conflict. The earnest search for truth through self-knowledge is truly religious. The truly religious individual begins with himself; his self-knowledge and understanding form the basis of all his activity. As he understands he will know what it is to serve and what it is to love.

IV

In the last three talks we have been considering that intelligence which is developed through the activities and habits of the self; that desire which is constantly accumulating and with which thought identifies itself as the me and the mine. This accumulative, identifying habit is called intelligence; the aggressive and self-expanding desire ever seeking security, certainty, is called intelligence. This enchainning habit-memory binds thought and so intelligence is imprisoned in the self. How can this intelligence, this mind that is petty, narrow, cruel, nationalistic, envious, comprehend the Real? How can thought which is the outcome of time, of self-protective activity comprehend that which is not of time?

We sometimes experience a state of tranquility, of extraordinary clarity and joy, when the mind is serene and still. These moments come unexpectedly, without invitation. Such experiencing is not the result of calculated, disciplined thought. It occurs when thought is self-forgetful; when thought has ceased to become, when the mind is not in the conflict of its own self-created problems. So our problem is not how such a creative, joyous moment shall come and be maintained but how to bring about the cessation of self-expansive thought, which does not imply self-immolation but the transcending of the activities of the self. When a machine is revolving very fast, as a fan with several blades, the separate parts are not visible but appear as one. So the self, the me, seems to be a unified entity but if its activities can be slowed down then we shall perceive that it is not a unified entity but made up of many separate and contending desires and pursuits. These separate wants and hopes, fears and joys make up the self. The self is a term to cover craving

in its different forms. To understand the self there must be an awareness of craving in its multiple aspects. The passive awareness, the choiceless discernment reveal the ways of the self, bringing freedom from bondage. Thus when the mind is tranquil and free of its own activity and chatter, there is supreme wisdom.

Our problem then is how to free thought from its accumulated experiences, memories. How can this self cease to be? Deep and true experience takes place only when the activity of this intelligence ceases. We see that unless there is an experience of truth none of our problems can be solved whether sociological, religious or personal. Conflict cannot come to an end by merely rearranging frontiers or reorganizing economic values or imposing a new ideology; throughout the centuries we have tried these many ways but conflict and sorrow have continued. Till there is a comprehension of the Real, merely pruning the branches of our self-expansive activity is of little use, for the central problem remains unsolved. Till we discover Truth there is no way out of our sorrows and problems. The solution is the direct experience of Truth when the mind is still, in the tranquillity of awareness, in the openness of receptivity.

Questioner: Would you please explain again what you mean?

Krishnamurti: We often have religious experiences sometimes vague, sometimes definite; experiences of intense devotion or joy, of being deeply vulnerable, of fleeting unity with all things; we try to utilize these experiences in meeting our difficulties and sorrows. These experiences are numerous but our thought, caught in time, turmoil and pain, tries to use them as stimulants to overcome our conflicts. So we say God or Truth will help us in our difficulties, but these experiences do not actually resolve our sorrow and confusion. Such moments of deep experience come when thought is not active in its self-protective memories; these experiences are independent of our striving and when we try to use them as stimulants for strength in our struggles, they only further the expansion of the self and its peculiar intelligence. So we come back to our question: how can this intelligence so sedulously cultivated cease? It can cease only through passive awareness.

Awareness is from moment to moment, it is not the cumulative effect of self-protective memories. Awareness is not determination nor is it the action of will. Awareness is the complete and unconditional surrender to what is, without rationalization, without the division of the observer and the observed. As awareness is non-accumulative, non-residual, it does not build up the self, positively or negatively. Awareness is ever in the present and so, non-identifying and non-repetitive; nor does it create habit.

Take, for instance, the habit of smoking and experiment with it

in awareness. Be aware of smoking, do not condemn, rationalize or accept, simply be aware. If you are so aware there is the cessation of the habit; if you are so aware there will be no recurrence of it but if you are not aware the habit will persist. This awareness is not the determination to cease or to indulge.

Be aware; there is a fundamental difference between being and becoming. To become aware you make effort and effort implies resistance and time, and leads to conflict. If you are aware in the moment there is no effort, no continuance of the self-protective intelligence. You are aware or you are not; the desire to be aware is only the activity of the sleeper, the dreamer. Awareness reveals the problem completely, fully, without denial or acceptance, justification or identification, and it is freedom which quickens understanding. Awareness is a unitary process of the observer and the observed.

Questioner: Can open, still receptivity of the mind come with the action of will or desire?

Krishnamurti: You may succeed in forcibly stilling the mind but what is the outcome of such effort? Death, is it not? You may succeed in silencing the mind but thought still remains petty, envious, contradictory, does it not? Through exertion, through an act of will we think an effortless state can be achieved in which we may experience the ecstasy of the Real. The experience of inexplicable joy or intense devotion or profound understanding comes only when there is effortless being.

Questioner: Are there not two kinds of intelligence, the one with which we function daily and the other which is higher, which guides, controls and is beneficial?

Krishnamurti: Does not the self for the sake of its own permanency divide itself into the high and the low, the controller and the controlled? Does not this division arise from the desire for continued self-expansion? However cunningly it might divide itself, the self is still the result of craving, it is still seeking different objectives through which to fulfill itself. A petty mind cannot possibly formulate something which is not also petty. The mind is essentially limited and whatever it creates is of itself. Its gods, its values, its objectives and activities are narrow and measurable and so it cannot understand that which is not of itself, the Immeasurable.

Questioner: Can a petty thought go beyond itself?

Krishnamurti: How can it? Greed is still greed even if it reaches for heaven. Only when it is aware of its own limitation does the limited thought cease. The limited thought cannot become the

free; when limitation ceases there is freedom. If you will experiment with awareness you will discover the truth of this.

It is the petty mind that creates problems for itself and through awareness of the cause of problems, the self, they are dissolved. To be aware of narrowness and its many results implies deep understanding of it on all the different levels of consciousness; pettiness in things, in relationship, in ideas. When we are conscious of being petty or violent or envious we make an effort not to be; we condemn it for we desire to be something else. This condemnatory attitude puts an end to the understanding of what is and its process. The desire to put an end to greed is another form of self-assertion and so is the cause of continued conflict and pain.

Questioner: What is wrong with purposeful thinking if it is logical?

Krishnamurti: If the thinker is unaware of himself though he may be purposeful, his logic will inevitably lead him to misery; if he is in authority, in a position of power, he brings misery and destruction upon others. That is what is happening in the world, is it not? Without self-knowledge thought is not based on Reality, it is ever in contradiction and its activities are mischievous and harmful.

To come back to our point: through awareness only can there be cessation of the cause of conflict. Be aware of any habit of thought or action; then you will recognize the rationalizing, condemnatory process which is preventing understanding. Through awareness—the reading of the book of habit page by page—comes self-knowledge. It is truth that frees, not your effort to be free. Awareness is the solution of our problems; we must experiment with it and discover its truth. It would be folly merely to accept; to accept is not to understand. Acceptance or non-acceptance is a positive act which hinders experimentation and understanding. Understanding that comes through experiment and self-knowledge brings confidence.

This confidence may be called faith. It is not the faith of the foolish; it is not faith in something. Ignorance may have faith in wisdom, darkness in light, cruelty in love, but such faith is still ignorance. This confidence or faith of which I am speaking comes through experimentation in self-knowledge, not through acceptance and hope. The self-confidence that many have is the outcome of ignorance, of achievement, of self-glory or of capacity. The confidence of which I speak is understanding, not the *I understand*, but understanding without self-identification. The confidence or faith in something, however noble, breeds only obstinacy and obstinacy is another term for credulity. The clever ones have destroyed blind faith but when they themselves are in serious conflict or sorrow they accept faith or become cynical. To believe is not to be religious; to have faith in something which is created by the mind is

not to be open to the Real. Confidence comes into being, it cannot be manufactured by the mind; confidence comes with experiment and discovery; not the experiment with belief, theory or memory but experimentation with self-knowledge. This confidence or faith is not self-imposed nor is it identified with belief, formulation, hope. It is not the outcome of self-expanding desire. In experimenting with awareness there is a discovery which is freeing in its understanding. This self-knowledge through passive awareness is from moment to moment, without accumulation; it is endless, truly creative. Through awareness there comes vulnerability to Truth.

To be open, vulnerable to the Real, thought must cease to be accumulative. It is not that thought-feeling must *become* non-greedy, which is still accumulative, a negative form of self-expansion, but it must *be* non-greedy. A greedy mind is a conflicting mind; a greedy mind is ever fearful, envious in its self-growth and fulfillment. Such a mind is ever changing the objects of its desire and this changing is considered growth; a greedy mind which renounces the world in order to seek Reality, God, is still greedy; greed is ever restless, ever seeking growth, fulfillment, and this restless activity creates self-assertive intelligence but is not capable of understanding the Real.

Greed is a complex problem! To live in the world of greed without greed needs deep understanding; to live simply, earning a right livelihood in a world organized on economic aggression and expansion is possible only for those who are discovering inward riches.

Questioner: In the very act of coming here are we not seeking some spark to enlighten us?

Krishnamurti: What is it that you are seeking?

Questioner: Wisdom and knowledge.

Krishnamurti: Why do you seek?

Questioner: We are seeking to fill the deep, hidden inner void.

Krishnamurti: We are then seeking something to fill our emptiness; this filler we call knowledge, wisdom, truth and so on. So we are not seeking truth, wisdom, but something to fill our aching loneliness. If we can find that which can enrich our inward poverty we think our search will end. Now can anything fill this void? Some are painfully conscious of it and others are not; some have sought to escape through activity, through stimulation, through mysterious rituals, through ideologies and so on; others are conscious of this void but have not found a way of covering it up. Most of us know

this fear, this panic of nothingness. We are seeking to overcome this fear, this emptiness; we are seeking something that can heal the aching agony of inner insufficiency. As long as you are convinced that you can find some escape you will go on seeking but is it not part of wisdom to see that all escape, no matter how alluring, is useless? When the truth about escape dawns on you will you persist in your search? Obviously not. Then we accept inevitably what is; this complete surrender to what is, is the liberating Truth, not the attainment of the objects of search.

Our life is conflict, pain; we crave security, permanency, but are caught in the net of the impermanent. We are the impermanent. Can the impermanent find the Eternal, the Timeless? Can illusion find Reality? Can ignorance find wisdom? Only with the cessation of the impermanent is there the permanent; with the cessation of ignorance is there wisdom. We are concerned with the cessation of the impermanent, the self.

Questioner: One of our great teachers has said, "Seek and ye shall find". Is it not advantageous to seek?

Krishnamurti: By this question we betray ourselves and how little we are aware of the ways of our thought. We are forever thinking of what is advantageous for us and that we desire. Do you think a mind that is seeking profit can find truth? If it is seeking truth as an advantage, then it is no longer seeking truth. Truth is beyond and above all personal advantage and gain. A mind that is seeking gain, achievement, can never find Truth. The search for gain is for security, for refuge, and Truth is not a security, a refuge. Truth is the liberator, sweeping away all refuge and security.

Besides, why do you seek? Is it not because you are in confusion and pain? Instead of seeking an escape through activity, through psychologists, through priests, through rituals, must you not search out the cause of conflict and sorrow in yourself? The cause is the self, craving. The deliverance from confusion and pain is in yourself and not another can free you.

Questioner: If we can open our consciousness to truth is that not sufficient?

Krishnamurti: We revert to this question in different ways over and over again. Can the mind, the self-consciousness, which is the product of time, understand or experience the Timeless? When the mind seeks will it find Reality, God? When the mind asserts that it must be open to Reality is it capable of being so?

If thought is aware that it is the product of ignorance, of the limited self, then there is a possibility for it to cease formulating, imagining, being occupied with itself. Only through awareness can thought transcend itself, not through will, which is another form of

self-expansive desire. When are we joyous? Is it the result of calculation, of an act of will? It happens when conflicting problems and demands of desire are absent. As a lake is calm when the winds stop so the mind is still when craving with its problems ceases. The mind cannot induce itself to be quiet, to be still; the lake is not calm till the winds cease. Till the problems the self creates cease there can be no tranquillity. The mind has to understand itself and not try to escape into illusion, or seek something that it is incapable of experiencing or understanding.

Questioner: Is there a technique for being aware?

Krishnamurti: What does this question imply? You seek a method by which you may learn to be aware. Awareness is not the result of practice, habit or time. As a tooth that causes intense pain has to be attended to immediately so sorrow, if intense, demands urgent alleviation. But instead we seek an escape or explain it away; we avoid the real issue which is the self. Because we are not facing our conflict, our sorrow, we assure ourselves lazily that we must make an effort to be aware and so we demand a technique for becoming aware.

So it is not by an act of will that truth is uncovered but through tranquil vulnerability the Real comes into being.

V

We have been considering the problem of intelligence, that intelligence which has been developed during the course of self-assertive struggles and self-protective pursuits, of acquisitive demands and imitative conformities; we saw that with that intelligence we hoped to solve our conflicts and discover or experience Truth or God. Can that intelligence ever experience the Real? If it cannot then how can it come to an end or be transformed? We saw that this is possible only through passive awareness and that we can at any time be aware without the will to become aware. To understand what is implied in awareness we examined greed and tried to understand its activities; greed not only for the tangible but also for power, for authority; greed for affection, for knowledge, for service and so on; we saw that we either condemn or justify greed thereby

identifying ourselves with it. We saw, too, that awareness is a process of discovery which becomes blocked through identification. When we are rightly aware of greed in its complexity there is no struggle against it, no negative assertion of non-greed, which is only another form of self-assertiveness; and in that awareness we will find that greed has ceased.

Awareness is not the result of practice for practice implies the formation of habit; habit is the denial of awareness. Awareness is of the moment and not a cumulative result. To say to ourselves that we shall *become* aware is not to be aware. To say that we are going to be non-greedy is merely to continue to be greedy, to be unaware of it.

How do we approach a complex problem? We do not surely meet complexity with complexity; we must approach it simply and the greater our simplicity the greater will be the clarification. To understand and experience Reality there must be utter simplicity and tranquillity. When we suddenly see a magnificent scenery or come upon a great thought, or listen to great music, we are utterly still. Our minds are not simple but to recognize complexity is to be simple. If you would understand yourself, your complexity, there must be open receptivity, the simplicity of non-identification. But we are not aware of beauty or complexity and so we chatter endlessly.

Questioner: We must not criticize then if we are to be aware?

Krishnamurti: Without probing deeply into oneself self-knowledge is not possible. What do we mean by self-criticism? The function of the mind is to probe and to comprehend. Without this probing into ourselves, without this deep awareness, there can be no understanding. We often indulge in the stupidity of criticizing others but few are capable of probing deeply into themselves. The function of the mind is not only to probe, to delve, but also to be silent. In silence there is comprehension. We are ever probing but we are rarely silent; in us rarely are there alert, passive intervals of tranquillity; we probe and are soon weary of it without the creative silence. But self-probing is as essential for the clarity of understanding as is stillness. As the earth is allowed to lie fallow during the winter so must thought be still after deep searching. This very fallowness is its renewal. If we delve deeply into ourselves and are still then in this stillness, in this openness, there is understanding.

Questioner: This complexity is so deep that one does not seem to have an opportunity for quietness.

Krishnamurti: Must there be an opportunity to be still, to be quiet? Must you create the occasion, the right environment to be

peaceful? Is it then peace? With right probing there comes right stillness. When do you look into yourself? When the problem demands it, when it is urgent, surely. But if you are seeking an opportunity to be silent then you are not aware. Self-probing comes with conflict and sorrow, and there must be passive receptivity to understand. Surely self-probing, stillness and understanding are in awareness a single process and not three separate states.

Questioner: Would you enlarge that point?

Krishnamurti: Let us take envy. Any resolution not to be envious is neither simple nor effective, it is even stupid. To determine not to be envious is to build walls of conclusions around oneself and these walls prevent understanding. But if you are aware you will discover the ways of envy; if there is interested alertness you will find its ramifications at different levels of the self. Each probing brings with it silence and understanding; as one cannot continuously probe deeply, which would only result in exhaustion, there must be spaces of alert inactivity. This watchful stillness is not the outcome of weariness; with self-probing there come easily and naturally moments of passive alertness. The more complex the problem the more intense is the probing and the silence. There need be no specially created occasion or opportunity for silence; the very perception of the complexity of a problem brings with it deep silence.

Our difficulty lies in that we have built around ourselves conclusions which we call understanding. These conclusions are hindrances to understanding. If you go into this more deeply you will see that there must be complete abandonment of all that has been accumulated for the being of understanding and wisdom. To be simple is not a conclusion, an intellectual concept for which you strive. There can be simplicity only when the self with its accumulation ceases. It is comparatively easy to renounce family, property, fame, things of the world; that is only a beginning; but it is extremely difficult to put away all knowledge, all conditioned memory. In this freedom, this aloneness, there is experience which is beyond and above all creations of the mind. Do not let us ask whether the mind ever can be free from conditioning, from influence; we shall find this out as we proceed in self-knowledge and understanding. Thought which is a result cannot understand the Causeless.

The ways of accumulation are subtle; accumulation is self-assertiveness, as is imitation. To come to a conclusion is to build a wall around oneself, a protective security which prevents understanding. Accumulated conclusions do not make for wisdom but only sustain the self. Without accumulation there is no self. A mind weighed down with accumulations is incapable of following the swift movement of life, incapable of deep and pliable awareness.

Questioner: Are you not encouraging separateness, individualism?

Krishnamurti: He who is influenced is separate, knowing the division of the high and the low, of merit and demerit. Aloneness in the sense of being free from influence is not separative, not antagonizing. It is a state to be experienced, not speculated upon. The self is ever separative, it is the cause of division, conflict and sorrow. Do you not feel separate; are not your activities those of a self-assertive, self-expansive individual? Obviously your thoughts and activities are now individualistic, narrow; it is your work, your achievement, your country, your belief, even your God. You are separate and so your social structure is based on self-assertiveness which causes untold misery and destruction; you may assert we are all one but in actual daily life your activities are separative, individualistic, competitive, ruthless, leading ultimately to war and misery.

If we are aware of this self-aggressive process in ourselves and understand its implications then there is a possibility of bringing about a peaceful and happy relationship between man and man. The very awareness of what is, is a liberative process. So long as we are unaware of what we are, and are trying to become something else, so long will there be distortion and pain. The very awareness of what I am brings about transformation and the freedom of understanding.

Questioner: Cannot one think about the Uncreated, about Reality, God?

Krishnamurti: The created cannot think about the Uncreated. It can think only about its own projection which is not the Real. Can thought which is the result of time, of influence, of imitation, think about that which is not measurable? It can only think about that which is known. What is knowable is not the Real, what is known is ever receding into the past and what is past is not the Eternal. You may speculate upon the unknown but you cannot think about it. When you think about something you are probing into it, subjecting it to different moods and influences. But such thinking is not meditation. Creativeness is a state of being which is not the outcome of thinking. Right meditation opens the door to the Real.

But let us go back to what we were considering. Are we aware that our so-called thinking is the result of influence, of conditioning, of imitation? Are you not influenced by propaganda, religious or secular, by the politician and the priest, by the economist and the advertiser? Collective worship and regimentation of thought are alike and both hinder the discovery and experience of Reality.

Propaganda is not the instrument of Truth, whether of organized religion or politics or business. If we would discover Truth we must be aware of the subtleties of influence, of challenge and of our response. Learning a technique, a method, does not lead to creative being. When the past ceases to influence the present, when time ceases, there is creative being which can be experienced only in deep meditation.

Questioner: Is not thinking the initial step to creative-ness?

Krishnamurti: The initial step is to be self-aware. Our thinking, as we said, is the result of the past; it is the result of conditioning, of imitation; that being so all effort it makes to free itself is vain. All it can do and must do is be aware of its own conditioning and cause; through the understanding of the cause there comes freedom from it. If we were aware of our stupidity, ignorance then there would be a possibility of wisdom; but to consider stupidity as a necessary beginning for intelligence is wrong thinking. If we recognize that we are stupid then that very recognition is the beginning of thoughtfulness; but recognizing it, if we try to become clever, then that very becoming is another form of stupidity.

Any definite pattern of thought prevents understanding. Understanding is not substitution; mere change of patterns, of conclusions, does not yield understanding. Understanding comes with self-awareness and self-knowledge. There is no substitute for self-knowledge. Is it not important first to understand oneself, to be aware of one's own conditioning rather than seek understanding outside of oneself? Understanding comes with the awareness of what is.

Questioner: Being imitative what shall we do?

Krishnamurti: Be self-aware which will reveal the hidden motives of imitation, envy, fear, the craving for security, for power and so on. This awareness when free of self-identification brings understanding and tranquillity which lead to the realization of supreme wisdom.

Questioner: Is not this process of awareness, of self-unfoldment another form of acquisition? Is not probing another means of self-expansive acquisitiveness?

Krishnamurti: If the questioner experimented with awareness he would discover the truth about his question. Understanding is never accumulative; understanding comes only when there is stillness, when there is passive alertness. There is no stillness, no passiv-

ity when the mind is acquisitive; acquisitiveness is ever restless, envious. As we said, awareness is not cumulative; through identification accumulation is built up, giving continuity to the self through memory. To be aware without self-identification, without condemnation or justification is extremely arduous, for our response is based on pleasure and pain, reward and punishment. How few are aware of constant identification; if we were we would not ask these questions which indicate unawareness. As a sleeper dreams that he must awaken but does not, for it is only a dream, so we are asking these questions without actually experimenting with awareness.

Questioner: Is there anything that one can do to be aware?

Krishnamurti: Are you not in conflict, in sorrow? If you are do you not search out its cause? The cause is the self, its torturing desires. To struggle with these desires only creates resistance, further pain, but if you are choicelessly aware of your craving then there comes creative understanding. It is the truth of this understanding that liberates, not your struggle against resistance to envy, anger, pride and so on. So awareness is not an act of will for will is resistance, the effort made by the self through desire to acquire, to grow, whether positively or negatively. Be aware of acquisitiveness, passively observing its ways on different levels; you will find this rather arduous, for thought-feeling sustains itself on identification and it is this which prevents the understanding of accumulation.

Be aware; take the journey of self-discovery. Do not ask what is going to happen on this journey which only betrays anxiety, fear, indicating your desire for security, for certainty. This desire for refuge prevents self-knowledge, self-unfoldment and so, understanding. Be aware of this inward anxiety and directly experience it; then you will discover what this awareness reveals. But unfortunately most of you only desire to talk about the journey without undertaking it.

Questioner: What happens to us at the end of the journey?

Krishnamurti: Is it not important for the questioner to be aware of why he is asking this question? Is it not because of the fear of the unknown, the desire to gain an end, or the assurance of self-continuity? Being in sorrow we seek happiness; being impermanent we search after the permanent; being in darkness we look for light. But if we were aware of what is, then the truth of sorrow, of impermanency, of imprisonment would liberate thought from its own ignorance.

Questioner: Is there no such thing as creative thinking?

Krishnamurti: It would be rather vain to consider what is creativeness. If we were aware of our conditioning then the truth of this would bring about creative being. To speculate upon creative being is a hindrance; all speculation is a hindrance to understanding. Only when the mind is simple, purged of all self-deception and cunning, cleansed of all accumulation, is there the Real. The purification of the mind is not an act of will nor the outcome of imitative compulsion. Awareness of what is, is liberating.

VI

As this is the last talk of this series perhaps it might be well to make a brief summary of what we have been considering during the past five Sundays. We have been discussing whether the process of what we call intelligence can resolve any of our problems and sorrows; whether the ant-like activity which has developed self-protective intelligence can bring about enlightenment and peace.

This activity on the surface, called intelligence, cannot resolve our many difficulties for within there is still confusion, turmoil and darkness. This intelligence has been developed through the expansion of the self, the ego, the me and the mine; this activity is the outcome of inner insufficiency, incompleteness. Outwardly thought is active, building and destroying, contradicting and modifying, renewing and suppressing; but within there is void and despair. The outer activity of plastic and steel, reform and counter reform, is ever lost in the inward emptiness and confusion. You may build wonderful structures or organize spaciouly over a smouldering volcano but what you construct is soon smothered by ashes and destroyed. So this expansive activity of the self, this intelligence, however alert, capable and industrious, cannot penetrate through its own darkness to Reality. This intelligence cannot at any time resolve its own conflicts and miseries for they are the outcome of its own activity. This intelligence is incapable of discovering Truth and only Truth can free us from ever increasing conflicts and sorrows.

We further considered how this self-expansive intelligence is to cease re-shaping itself negatively. Whether positive or negative, the activity of craving is still within the framework of the self and can

this activity ever come to an end? We said that only through self-awareness can this accumulative intelligence of the self cease. We saw this awareness to be from moment to moment, without cumulative power; that in this awareness self-identification-condemnation-modification cannot take place and so there is deep and full understanding. We said that this awareness is not progressive but an instantaneous perception and that the thought of progressive becoming prevents immediate clarification.

This morning we shall consider meditation. In understanding it we can perhaps comprehend the full and deep significance of passive awareness. Awareness is right meditation and without meditation there can be no self-knowledge. Earnestness in the discovery of one's motives is more important than to seek out a method of meditation. The more earnest one is the more capacity one has to probe and to perceive. So it is essential to be earnest rather than to form and pursue a conclusion, to be earnest rather than arbitrarily hold to an intention. If we merely hold to an intention, a conclusion, a resolution, thought becomes narrow, obstinate, fixed, but if there is earnestness this very quality is capable of deep penetration. The difficulty is in being constantly earnest. Spiritual window shopping is not an indication of seriousness. If you have the capacity to allow thought to unroll itself fully then you will perceive that one thought contains, or is related to, all thought. There is no need to go from teacher to teacher, from guru to guru, from leader to leader, for all things are contained in you, the beginning and the end. None can help you to discover the Real; no ritual, no collective worship, no authority can help you. Another may point out the direction but to make of him an authority, a gateway to the Real, a necessity, is to be ignorant, which breeds fear and superstition.

To delve deeply within oneself and discover needs earnestness. This probing we consider tedious, uninspiring, so we depend upon stimulants, Masters, saviors, leaders, to encourage us to understand ourselves. This encouragement or stimulation becomes a necessity, an addiction, and weakens the quality of earnestness. Being in contradiction and sorrow we think we are incapable of finding a solution so we look to another or try to find the answer in a book. To look within demands earnest application which is not brought about through the practice of any method. It comes through serious interest and awareness. If one is interested in something thought pursues it, consciously or unconsciously, in spite of fatigue and distraction. If you are interested in painting then every light, every shade has meaning, you do not have to exert to be interested, you do not have to force yourself to observe but through the very intensity of interest even unconsciously you are observing, discovering, experiencing. Similarly if there is an interest in the comprehension and dissolution of sorrow then that very interest turns the pages of the book of self-knowledge.

To have a goal, an end to be achieved, prevents self-knowledge; earnest awareness reveals the ways of the self. Without self-knowledge there can be no understanding; self-knowledge is the beginning of wisdom. Our thought is the result of the past; our thinking is based on the past, upon conditioning. Without comprehending this past there is no understanding of the Real. The comprehension of the past lies through the present. The Real is not the reward for self-knowledge. The Real is Causeless and thought that has cause cannot experience it. Without a foundation there can be no lasting structure and the right foundation for understanding is self-knowledge. So all right thinking is the outcome of self-knowledge. If I do not know myself how can I understand anything else? For without self-knowledge all knowledge is in vain. Without self-knowledge incessant activity is of ignorance; this incessant activity, inner or outer, only causes destruction and misery.

Understanding of the ways of the self leads to freedom. Virtue is freedom, orderliness; without order, freedom, there can be no experiencing of the Real. In virtue there is freedom, not in the becoming virtuous. The desire to become, negatively or positively, is self-expansive and in the expansion of the self there can be no freedom.

Questioner: You said the Real should not be an incentive. It seems to me that if I try to think of the Real I am better able to understand myself and my difficulties.

Krishnamurti: Is it possible to think about the Real? We may be able to formulate, imagine, speculate upon what we consider the Real to be but is it the Real? Can we think about the unknowable? Can we think, meditate upon the Timeless when our thought is the result of the past, of time? The past is ever the known and thought which is based on it can only create the known. So to think about Truth is to be caught in the net of ignorance. If thought is able to think about Truth then it will not be Truth. Truth is a state of being in which the so-called activity of thought has ceased. Thinking, as we know it, is the result of the self-expansive process of time, of the past; it is the result of the movement of the known to the known. Thought which is the outcome of a cause can never formulate the Causeless. It can only think about the known for it is the product of the known.

What is known is not the Real. Our thought is occupied with the constant search for security, for certainty. Self-expansive intelligence by its very nature craves a refuge, either through negation or assertion. How can a mind that is ever seeking certainty, stimulation, encouragement, possibly think of that which is illimitable? You may read about it which is unfortunate, you may verbalize it which is a waste of time, but it is not the Real. When you say that

by thinking about Truth you can better solve your difficulties and sorrows, you are using the supposed truth as a palliative; as with all drugs, sleep and dullness soon follow. Why seek external stimulants when the problem demands an understanding of its maker?

As I was saying, virtue gives freedom but there is no freedom in *becoming* virtuous. There is a vast and unbridgeable difference between being and becoming.

Questioner: Is there a difference between truth and virtue?

Krishnamurti: Virtue gives freedom for thought to be tranquil, to experience the Real. So virtue is not an end in itself, only Truth is. To be a slave to passion is to be without freedom and in freedom alone can there be discovery and experience of the Real. Greed like anger is a disturbing factor, is it not? Envy is ever restless, never still. Craving is ever changing the object of its fulfillment, from things to passion, to virtue, to the idea of God. The greed for Reality is the same as the greed for possessions.

Craving comes through perception, contact, sensation; desire seeks fulfillment so there is identification, the me and the mine. Being satiated with things desire pursues other forms of gratification, more subtle forms of fulfillment in relationship, in knowledge, in virtue, in the realization of God. Craving is the root cause of all conflict and sorrow. All forms of becoming, negative or positive, cause conflict, resistance.

Questioner: Is there any difference between awareness and that of which we are aware? Is the observer different from his thoughts?

Krishnamurti: The observer and the observed are one; the thinker and his thoughts are one. To experience the thinker and his thought as one is very arduous for the thinker is ever taking shelter behind his thought; he separates himself from his thoughts to safeguard himself, to give himself continuity, permanency; he modifies or changes his thoughts, but he remains. This pursuit of thought apart from himself, this changing, transforming it leads to illusion. The thinker *is* his thought; the thinker and his thoughts are not two separate processes.

The questioner asks if awareness is different from the object of awareness. We generally regard our thoughts as being apart from ourselves; we are not aware of the thinker and his thought as one. This is precisely the difficulty. After all, the qualities of the self are not separate from the self; the self is not something apart from its thoughts, from its attributes. The self is put together, made up, and the self is *not* when the parts are dissolved. But in illusion the self separates itself from its qualities in order to protect itself, to give

itself continuity, permanency. It takes refuge in its qualities through separating itself from them. The self asserts that it is this and is that; the self, the I, modifies, changes, transforms its thoughts, qualities, but this change only gives strength to the self, to its protective walls. But if you are aware deeply you will perceive that the thinker and his thoughts are one; the observer is the observed. To experience this actual integrated fact is extremely difficult and a right meditation is the way to this integration.

Questioner: How can I be on the defense against aggression without action? Morality demands that we should do something against evil?

Krishnamurti: To defend is to be aggressive. Should you fight evil by evil? Through wrong means can right be established? Can there be peace in the world by murdering those who are murderers? As long as we divide ourselves into groups, nationals, different religions and ideologies there will be the aggressor and the defender. To be without virtue is to be without freedom, which is evil. The evil cannot be overcome by another evil, by another opposing desire.

Questioner: Experiencing is not necessarily a becoming, is it?

Krishnamurti: Additive process prevents the experiencing of the Real. Where there is accumulation there is a becoming of the self which is the cause of conflict and pain. The accumulative desire for pleasure and the avoidance of pain is a becoming. Awareness is non-accumulative for it is ever discovering truth and truth can only be when there is no accumulation, when there is no imitation. Effort of the self can never bring about freedom for effort implies resistance and resistance can be dissolved only through choiceless awareness, effortless discernment. It is truth alone that frees, not the activity of will. The awareness of truth is liberating; the awareness of greed and of the truth about it brings liberation from greed.

Meditation is the purgation from the mind of all its accumulations; the purgation of the power to gather, to identify, to become; the purgation of self-growth of self-fulfillment; meditation is the freeing of the mind from memory, from time. Thought is the product of the past, it is rooted in the past; thought is the continuation of accumulative becoming, and that which is a result cannot understand or experience that which is without a cause. What can be formulated is not the Real and the word is not the experience. Memory, the maker of time, is an impediment to the Timeless.

Questioner: Why is memory an impediment?

Krishnamurti: Memory, as the identifying process, gives continuity to the self. Memory then is an enclosing, hindering activity. On it the whole structure of the ego, the I, is built. We are considering psychological memory not the memory for speech, facts, for the development of technique and so on. Any activity of the self is an impediment to truth; any activity or education that conditions the mind through nationalism, through identification with a group, an ideology, a dogma, is an impediment to Truth.

Conditioned knowledge is a hindrance to Reality. Understanding comes with the cessation of all activity of the mind—when the mind is utterly free, silent, tranquil. Craving is ever accumulative and time-binding; desire for a goal, knowledge, experience, growth, fulfillment and even the *desire for God or Truth* is an impediment. The mind must purge itself of all its self-created impediments for supreme wisdom to be.

Meditation as it is generally understood and practised is a process of the expansion of the self; often meditation is a form of self-hypnosis. In so-called meditation effort very often is directed towards becoming like a Master, which is imitation. All such meditation leads to illusion.

The craving for achievement demands a technique, a method, practice of which is considered meditation. Through compulsion, imitation and through the formation of new habits and disciplines there will be no freedom, no understanding; through the means of time the Timeless is not experienced. The change of the objects of desire does not bring release from conflict and sorrow. Will is self-expansive intelligence and the activity of will to be or not to be, to gather or renounce, is still of the self. To be aware of the process of craving with its accumulative memory is to experience Truth which is the only liberator.

Awareness flows into meditation; in meditation, Being, the Eternal, is experienced. Becoming can never transform itself into Being. Becoming, the expansive and enclosing activity of the self, must cease; then there is Being. This Being cannot be thought about, cannot be imagined; the very thought about it is a hindrance; all that thought can do is to be aware of its own complex and subtle becoming, its own cunning intelligence and will. Through self-knowledge there comes right thinking which is the foundation for right meditation. Meditation should not be confused with prayer. Supplicatory prayer does not lead to supreme wisdom for it ever maintains the division between self and the Other.

In silence, in supreme tranquillity when the restless activity of memory has ceased, there is the Immeasurable, the Eternal.

KRISHNAMURTI
TALKS
MADRAS—INDIA
1947

(Verbatim Report)

KRISHNAMURTI'S
TALKS
MADRAS—INDIA
1947

. (*Verbatim Report*)

Copyright 1949 by Krishnamurti Writings Inc.

Published by
KRISHNAMURTI WRITINGS INC.
OJAI, CALIFORNIA
MADRAS, INDIA
LONDON, ENGLAND

Translation and all rights reserved
Printed in India by G. S. Press, Madras

influences, so many actions upon it, that it is constantly changing. And therefore, no formula of any kind can ever solve a dynamic problem. And yet that is what we are trying to do. The left and the right are trying to solve it within the framework of certain formulae, certain set ideas. But the formulae can never solve anything. Systems have never solved anything, nor brought about a revolution. A revolution has been brought about by creative thinkers, not by mere followers. So what is required at the present time, I feel, is not a new formula, not a new system, neither of the left nor of the right. but a different approach, and that is important. If you have a problem what matters is how you approach it. If you approach it with a fixed mentality, with set ideas, you will not solve the problem, because the problem is not static. It is constantly undergoing a change and the fact that it cannot be solved by mere formulae seems to be obvious and I hope it will be obvious to you by the time I finish with these talks.

What I feel important in this is that each one of us should solve this problem and not leave it to the leaders. This problem, this catastrophe requires, not static thinking but revolutionary thinking, a thinking which is not based on any ideology, whether of Hinduism, Nationalism or Capitalism. It requires a change in our thinking. And so, the approach to the problem becomes all important. The 'how' is more important than 'action'. So, to know how to approach this catastrophe is more important than what to do about it. That 'how' can only be understood, when we are capable of looking at the problem through ourselves and not through formulae. That is, as it is a world catastrophe it requires a mind that is capable of looking at it without any prejudice. You cannot look at it as a Brahmin or as a Musalman, as a Christian or as a Buddhist. Because we have looked at it in the past in this way we have brought about the crisis. Because of tradition and other absurdities among us, we have brought about this problem and if we approach the problem with the same mentality, we shall not clarify or understand it, but only further it. It is, as if we were standing near a precipice with our minds biased, and we have come to that bias through centuries of division, communal and social, rich and poor, divisions of formulae, organized religious divisions and so on

have brought us to this appalling misery and confusion. If we would understand it, we must go away from the precipice and look at the problem. We cannot stand at the precipice at the edge of the precipice and try to solve the problem. On the contrary we must completely abandon those causes which have brought us to that stage and look at the problem from a distance and that is where our difficulty is. We know the catastrophe, we know the sociological causes of the wars that have been fought and the wars that are going to be fought. Preparations are going on with marvellous skill for the third war and you and I know that is the edge of the precipice. I do not think India is going to escape from it. Most of us realize, how comparatively serious the whole thing is.' We read about it all in the papers but are distracted away by our immediate demands and pleasures and pains. But the catastrophe is enormously serious and that is why if we would salvage something out of this catastrophe, we would become very serious and feel sorry for the absurdities of class divisions and the like. If the problem were serious enough we would do something about it. If you had a tooth-ache you would do something immediately. But this pain is much greater and more grievous than a tooth-ache. It is more continuous, more distant and that is why we are doing nothing. We are looking to leaders, gurus, formulae, systems, etc., we look either to Moscow or to Washington. So, we are at the edge of it and we have to confront it.

This catastrophe has been brought about by each one of us. We are confused within us and that confusion manifests itself in the outer. So, each one, Muslim, Hindu, Buddhist, Christian, is responsible for this misery. Neither the capitalist nor the socialist can escape from it, and each one is responsible for it. Since we have brought about this catastrophe, each one of us is responsible and must confront it. That is what is called bringing about a new way of thinking, a new way of looking and therefore it is important to realize how extraordinarily vital is an individual at the present time. Please differentiate between the individual and individualistic action. Individualistic action takes place when the individual acts as a part and not as a whole. That is, when he is thinking in terms of power, greed and position, then he is acting individualistically. This has led to this crisis, and when he

acts as a whole being, that is, individually, then such an action has immense significance. We will discuss this as we go along, every Sunday.

What I want to do this evening is more or less briefly and simply to put to you in *resumé* the formulation of some of these ideas. So, as I say, since the individual is confused, you are confused. Since you as an individual are confused, you are bound to spread confusion. Your State, your Government, your Religion, each one of these is bound to be confused because you are the State and you bring about your Society. The Society is the relationship between two individuals and that Society that is produced shares the greed, the lust for power and all the rest of it. So the confusion is in us and it projects itself in action into the world and we create the world crisis. After all war is only an outward and spectacular result of our daily life. So, if we do not transform our daily life and bear responsibility for it, not superficially but fundamentally, really and profoundly, we cannot escape from this chaos that is coming. And therefore, for me, the importance of the individual is supreme, but not as the individual in opposition to Society, in opposition to the whole. I think we should be very clear about this point. When we regard the individual and his function in society we have to consider the individual as a whole and not only the individual's activity which may be antisocial. It is a world-wide problem and it is exactly the same in America, in Europe and Damascus. I heard two Syrians talking about this problem in French in the same way as you and I talk here. Because you and I have brought about this catastrophe, we should be responsible for it, because no leader, no guru, no politician, no teacher is going to save us. Since the problem is vital and is constantly undergoing change, no formulae can solve it.

So what is required is right thinking. Right thinking is not a formula. It is not based on any system. Right thinking can only take place when there is self-knowledge, that is, when the individual understands his total position and that is where we will find the greatest difficulty. To understand something requires an intensity, an unnatural intellectual intensity. Your approach is going to be the most difficult job as you are not used to thinking as a whole but only

used to thinking compartmentally. So right thinking seems to me to be the solution for the present chaos and right thinking cannot come either through any formula or through following anybody. Right thinking can only take place through self-knowledge, that is, knowing yourself. To know yourself you have to study yourself. If one is to understand oneself he must cease to condemn. If you understand something you must not compare it with something else. You must study it by itself. If you would understand it you must not judge or condemn or identify yourself with it. If you would understand and if you condemn, surely you would put a stop to understanding altogether. If you would understand yourself the whole process being physiological as well as psychological we must approach it without condemnation which is an extraordinarily difficult task. I do not know if you have ever tried it or experimented with it yourself, to see how far you can understand yourself.

The religious person will state that he is god, and the extreme left-winger that he is nothing but a set of reactions. Therefore they have reached conclusions and stopped all real thinking; their actions are not based on right thinking and therefore not resulting from self-knowledge. Self-knowledge is not possible if there is any sense of condemnation or identification. In other words, relationship with one or with the many is a process of self-revolution through self-knowledge. And it is only right thinking which can create a new set of values which will completely supersede the false set of values, not by replacing old values with new formulae, but with the values that you have discovered and which were not handed down to you by a guru, by a political leader, by a swami, by this or that person, values that you have through your self-awareness discovered. It is in the present there is right thinking and that is going to solve the world-chaos and that means you have to withdraw from the base and become a centre of right thinking. Surely this is what has happened always in those moments, in those times when the world had to face such crises. There were a few who, seeing the confusion and the impossibility of altering that catastrophe, withdrew and formed groups. Who is going to take the trouble now-a-days to settle down and very seriously think of the whole problem? Those who study, study by a formula, limited by conditioning?

But there are very few who study the chaos without a system, without being conditioned and it is they who are going to save, because they will be the creators. I hope that during these coming weeks it will be possible for us to be really serious, to discover this creative thinking, which is the real discovery of truth, but this creation cannot be formulated. What is creation? Deep meditation and self-abnegation, as it is to most of us? Because we create an image and live in that image that is not God. We invite Reality, but Reality cannot be invited. It must come. To let it come there must be the right feeling, that is, mind must put away all the things that it knows, which is an enormously difficult task and without that reality, whatever action we do on the precipice is futile. So it is my intention, during my talks, to consider with those who are really serious and help them to experience directly this creative reality.

To do that we shall have to arrange discussions every other day here between 7-30 in the morning and 9. But what is important in these talks and discussions is to be really earnest, because earnestness is not a matter created, a matter of environmental cause. Then earnestness becomes merely transient. But if we realise this chaos, misery and appalling suffering, it will make us serious. And it is this seriousness and earnestness that are required, to solve this problem.

I have been given two or three questions and I shall try to answer them.

Question: The communist believes that on guaranteeing food, clothing and shelter to every individual and abolishing private property a state can be created in which we can live happily. What do you say about it?

Krishnamurti: I wonder what you would say? I also wonder whether you have ever thought about this problem. It will be extraordinarily interesting to find out what you would think about it. It is your problem also because we do need clothes, food and shelter. We need to organize that on a world-scale not just on a communal scale, which means we need people who are not thinking in terms of nationalism, etc., but thinking in terms of man. Not in terms of formulae but in terms of human happiness, and not

portant than bread. I am not laying down anything dogmatically. We can discuss this during the coming several weeks. But if we merely adhered to the formula with all its implications, then as has been over and over again proved by history, it would be futile.

After all what is the State? What is Government? It represents the relationship of individuals. If our relationship is based on greed, competition etc., we will have a Government that will represent us. This is an obviously simple fact. You need not read history to find this out. And if we do not lay emphasis on the right issue but are merely carried away by issues of secondary importance, how can we succeed? To lay emphasis on something that is of secondary importance rather than on the major issues is to produce confusion and perhaps that is the interest of those who want to gain power.

So in order to bring about a happy state for man, that is, for you and me, and since we do not live by bread alone, we have to understand the psychological factors, the complexities that exist in each one of us; and we must free ourselves from such conditioning as greed for power. Without understanding all this, to organize for bread becomes impossible. So without transformation of the individual there will be no happiness for man and if you are not willing to change, then surely you have vested interests in religion, in property, in ideals and so on. Since you have vested interests and since you cannot be shaken, the extreme left winger says 'destroy them'. What is important in all this is, to take each problem as a whole, not as a part, and try to solve the problem. In part you can never find the solution but you can find the solution only by understanding the problem as a whole.

Question : Mahatma Gandhi and others believe that the time has come when men of good-will, the just, the wise-men should join together to organize to fight the present crisis. Are you not escaping from this duty as most of our spiritual leaders are doing?

Krishnamurti : It is obviously necessary that men of good-will all over the world should come together. That goes without saying. But how can they come together? We want to do something fundamentally and also peacefully. Our

function is to do something because we are good at heart. But individually the good at heart have also formulae. They want to act in a certain way and then we begin. Then we find we cannot get on. Men of good-will should not have formulae. They should be above formulae and not be part of any system. And that is where we find the difficulty. First of all I do not believe in leadership. I think the very idea of leading somebody is antisocial, anti-spiritual, and with that idea I wish to explain my position.

First of all, as I said during the talk, any action on the edge of the precipice will only create further confusion for the very reason that we are at the edge of the precipice, that we are confused. And action out of confusion cannot produce good results but will only further the confusion. So what we can do is to move away from the confusion, that is, the confusion within ourselves. And that is what I am doing; moving away from confusion, political, spiritual, psychological and helping those who want to withdraw from that confusion. But in order to understand the confusion they must look at it and it requires enormous thinking. Surely such a person is not an escapist. How can you act when you yourself are in confusion? How can you bring about clarity if you are blind and how can you lead anybody? When a man realizes that he is blind and confused he should first free himself from confusion and from those bondages which are binding and blinding him. To act without the clarification is to create further misery and the idea of following is really very important. The idea of having a leader should be really understood. We have been led, socially, economically, religiously by our leaders. You may ask negatively; but for them, what would have been our condition? Is it not an important question to ask? Is it not the fact that we are being led which shows our incapacity to think for ourselves, to live rightly for ourselves? We depend on somebody to tell us how to act, how to think; in other words our system of upbringing is based on *what* to think and not *how* to think and hence we need leaders. And I assure you the present chaos does not demand new leaders. It does demand something totally different, that is, for each individual to become a light to himself and not be dependent on somebody else. And that requires great effort and understanding on the part

of each one of us. So, men of good-will are many in the world. If you really come down to facts you and I are men of good-will at moments. We want to live peacefully in the world. But so many influences and conditions have over-powered us and it is from these we have to free ourselves. That depends naturally on each one of us and not on somebody else. So, that means that men of good-will must also be free from conditioning, from nationalistic and communalistic ideals. They must cease to be nationalistic. They must cease to think as Brahmins, Muslims, Christians and so on. They must have no definite formula. For that is what is preventing us from coming together. If you are a Hindu you want to express your good-will within the frame-work of Hinduism and where will that lead you? The same applies to the Christian, the Musalman and so on. And therefore we are back to the whole problem which is much more difficult than it appears superficially.

By all means men of good-will should come together. But they do not unfortunately, because they all have the conditioning which society has imposed upon them and that is why I am saying that we should free ourselves from those conditionings and think in new terms. And it is for you to begin and not for the leader or the men of good-will. It is you who have to live with your neighbour and not the leader.

So in all these questions what is important, it seems to me, is the primary issue; we must not be confused with secondary problems. The primary issue is you and not somebody else. Because we have given ourselves over to the guru, to the political leader, to a theory, we have created in ourselves a state of confusion. Because one theory can be superseded by another theory and one leader can supersede another leader, we get confused. The intellectuals have failed. Their theories have also failed and if we depend on leaders we shall only plunge further into misery and drag humanity too with us. To resist the absurdities of leadership is extraordinarily difficult because we are lazy and because we hope somebody else will solve the problem. So it is important for us to realize the fact that not someone else but we are responsible for this misery and no leader can transform it. To understand this, requires extraordinary effort but we waste our energies

in such absurd ways that we cannot tackle the problem fully and completely.

Question: Young men have said to me again and again: We are frustrated, we do not know what we are to do in the present crisis. Our leaders are unable to lead us as they are themselves confused. We expected so much from political independence and from the settlement with the Muslim league.

Krishnamurti: There are so many questions involved in this question. So one has to take them one by one. First of all: 'we are frustrated'. You know the meaning of frustration. You want something and you cannot get it and you feel lost and you feel that you have been prevented from getting it. You want to get a job and cannot get it and you feel frustrated. You want to marry a woman and you cannot do that and you feel frustrated, prevented or held back. I want to have power and position and I am thwarted and I feel lost, and a wall has arisen between me and that which I want to gain.

Before you say that you feel frustrated, you must find out if ever you are in a position when you are not frustrated. As it is, you get all you want, yet you want something more. So there is constant frustration. It is constant because of emptiness, because you feel empty, economically, psychologically and spiritually empty. You think you can fill that emptiness by getting what you want. But if you examine very closely you will find that you can never fill that emptiness. We have tried to, by much study, by science, through various means of destruction, by pursuing gurus. But as you cannot fill that void you feel frustrated. That is a psychological fact.

Now what is this emptiness? Have you ever examined it? To understand it you must cease trying to fill it. It is like a man filling a bucket with a hole in it. It is always leaking and it can never be filled and you will say that such a man is unbalanced.

In this problem itself is the answer and not away from it. So, if we understood the process of frustration and its implications, the questions could be answered comparatively simply.

leaders are unable to lead us ; we expected so much political independence, and from the settlement with the League. We come back to the same problem. Who the leader? You create him, because you want somebody to tell you what to do. Because we are too lazy to think what we want, and always like to be told by another. Logically he becomes your master and because you are afraid he is also confused. So out of our confusion we

When the leader is confused we blame him. We do not blame ourselves but only blame somebody else.

*expected so much from the settlement with the Mus-
que.* Do you mean to say that through separation you will find any solution? You may get better jobs. It is like when you allow war, which is the major evil, minor evils follow. Once you admit division between peoples, between groups, between Brahmans and the rest, you create confusion, and a settlement based on divisions of people has no solution at all. This has been proved over and over again through history, and still we are doing it.

When you look at all these problems of distribution of men of good-will and of frustration, you will see they are all closely interrelated. We have not seen the relationship, because we have tried to solve each problem separately on its own level. The only solution to end confusion is after all Truth which liberates. To let Truth come to you, you have to be free from bondage. Not only from the subtle bondages and the obvious ones but also from nationalism, communalism etc. If we do this we will bring about clarity in ourselves.

October 22, 1947

II

We have got a very difficult subject in understanding ourselves. As we have got a very difficult subject to deal with it requires a great deal of patience and we must not jump to conclusions. It requires a great deal of study and patient listening, a careful analysis and a sense of detachment,

...is not intellectual detachment, but actual observation. So, if you're willing we will undertake this journey together to understand this problem of life and while on that journey let us discover together. My interest would be to talk together. But as there are many here, it is impossible to exchange ideas, to discuss them, but I will try in these conversations every Sunday to answer as many questions as possible so that I do not leave one stone unturned, and by that means you and I can see this whole complex problem which we call life. So, in making this journey let us not condemn or come to any definite conclusion, which you will towards the end but not yet.

Because we are too close to the problem, we do not know yet how to observe. Because we are too close to the problems such as poverty, the war that is coming, etc., we are incapable of real observation, and real study and understanding. So let us not jump to conclusions. I am only going to paint a picture, which though I paint it, is also yours, because you are dealing with life, the life which is in Europe, in Russia, in Japan, in chaotic China or in the somewhat orderly America. We deal with the whole of it and if we are to deal with it sanely, there must be no conclusion as the moment we conclude we put a stop to thinking.

I am not here to give you ideas but on the contrary, I am here to discuss together with you if we can, seriously and earnestly the problem of living. We are too much accustomed to listening to leaders and to discussions, and therefore it is unfortunate that it is difficult for us to discuss without jumping to conclusions or trying to find out what are the inner motives of the speaker. I have no inner motive but I want to state something which is yours, not mine, and I want to describe something which is true.

As life is not merely one phase, let us not at any time approach it through any exclusive path, either the intellectual, or the emotional. Because by emphasizing one phase or one path, we will not have the whole picture, and you and I are trying to understand the whole picture. If we have a canvas in front of us with a picture, if we merely study one corner of it, surely we will miss the whole picture. If you are an economist and view life from the economic point of view you will miss the whole picture. The same is true if

you are a socialist or a communist or a capitalist, etc. So even though you are specialized in philosophy, economy or law, etc., put them aside for the moment at least because in that problem and not merely in a part of it lies the solution. The more we specialize the more we are going to destroy ourselves. It is a biological fact. Animals that have specialized have perished. So, similarly, as our problem is not a specialized problem let us look at it from every point of view. There are only very few who can look at the canvas and get the whole significance of the picture and it is they who are the real saviours and not the specialists.

As I was saying, life is a very complex problem and a very complex problem must naturally be approached very simply. Take for example a child which is a very complex entity; yet to understand a child our mind should be very simple. If you see a beautiful picture or a lovely sunset, if you are comparing them with other pictures or sunsets, you won't understand the picture or the sunset. Similarly life is very complex and it involves actual thinking, feeling, earning one's livelihood, relationship, search for truth, etc. So to understand life we must have an extraordinarily simple mind, not an innocent one, a very simple mind that sees directly everything as it is and not translated according to what it wants. This is one of our difficulties: to approach the complex problem of life simply. To understand and to approach simply, we have naturally to ask ourselves this question: what is our relationship to this problem, this chaos and this degradation that we see about us, where man is against man, ideas against another set of ideas, where despair is prevailing? Perhaps you do not know about this despair. In Europe they feel it vitally because they see how everything has failed education, religion, one system after another has collapsed.

So, how do you regard this chaos, this frightful confusion? How would you set about to bring order out of this chaos? Where would you begin? Obviously with yourselves because your relationship with the chaos is direct. Let us not blame a few insane leaders. Because you and I have created this chaos, to bring order we must begin with our house, with ourselves. We are not to begin with a system; we are not to begin with an idea; we are not to begin with a revolution; we are not to begin with a theory; we must begin with

ourselves, because we are responsible for ourselves. Without us there is no world and so we are the world and we are the problem, which is not an intellectual theory but a fact. So do not rush to put it aside, which is usually one of our escapes, one of our clever means of getting out of it. Because when we deal with it so directly, what we feel and what we do is of vital significance and because we are unwilling to face it we say 'get on'.

As it is an irrefutable fact that we are the world and we have created the mess, it is through us alone that the salvation lies and not through something else and that is the basis of what I am going to say about the whole problem. Because the problem is not external to you; to understand it you have to understand yourself. Though it sounds very simple it is extremely complex. If everyone in the world would observe decently and kindly without condemnation and exploitation, there would be peace in the world. So the problem is your responsibility, a responsibility you have shirked; the moment you recognize that you are in the mess you have to act positively and vigorously; but we do not want to act positively, therefore we look to a leader and to a system. So in my talks and discussions the only starting point and the only essential point is you.

For several reasons we have overshadowed our responsibility, it has been put away, discharged, hidden, dispelled or submerged. This chaos is the result of systems whether the capitalistic, the socialistic, the communistic or the brahminic. That is, we have systems and formulae and they are more important to us than the individual. If we will observe still further we will find that organized society, in which we include education, religion, etc., has smothered our individual responsibility. You believe and your belief is merely a condition imposed upon you because it gratifies you and gives you security in society, factually, psychologically and abstractively. So, when you believe, your individual responsibility is taken away and you are working just like a machine. When society becomes more important the importance of bureaucracy becomes overwhelming. Take the example of a political party. When you join it you become a party-machine. You want to dominate, you want to put your ideas through. So the party,

the organization, the system become much more important than you and yet you do not realize it.

Again take the case of education. I do not know why we are educated. What does it all mean? What is the purpose of education? You become lawyers, mathematicians, chemical engineers and so on. You are educated to be something and therefore you cease to be the individual who is responsible, but you are specialized. The more we are educated the more conditioned we are. The more we read the more we repeat "Teach the people how to read and then we will have no revolution" is a famous saying. With education we have the regimentation through the Army, the Navy, the Police, etc. So these are the many factors which make us unconscious of our responsibility. We all function as machines because as we are members of a party or group, we have no responsibility.

So in order to transform this chaos and darkness we have to start with ourselves and not with the machine, because psychologically you are always the master of the machine or the system. So we shall start from this point: you are the only person that matters and not the society because your relationship with one another is the society. What you think, what you feel, what you do is of the utmost importance because you create the society and the environment

I will now answer some of the questions sent to me.

I do not prepare beforehand the answers to these questions. Generally I do not even like to look at them in advance as I wish to answer directly and so I am not choosing what I want to answer. The question will receive the right answer if the questioner is serious in his intentions. If you merely ask an intellectual question to trap me you may trap me but you will lose out. But if you ask really seriously, you will find that there is a serious answer.

Question: What is the kind of thinking needed today to live in peace? At the same time could you show a way by which millions of unemployed people can lead a life without starvation.

Krishnamurti: To have peace you must live peacefully. Property is one of the causes of contention. To own

things, whether through control of property by which you gain more and more or through relationship with ideas, will create contention. So if you want peace you must live without greed, because greed leads to nationalism and it is a factor which divides people. From greed we come to envy and a desire to possess. All these create competition between man and man. Organized religion is also one of the factors that separate man from man for we say we are Christians, Hindus, etc. You believe and I do not believe and therefore there is contention. You want to convert me and I think my religion is much better than yours, nearer the supreme. So to have peace in the world, which is very essential now, we must be peaceful. You cannot have peace through communalism. You cannot have peace through intelligence whether it is the intelligence of the Brahmin or of one of another caste or of the American or of the German. To have peace in the world we must cease to be greedy. To have peace in the world we must cease to be a Brahmin, a Hindu, a Muslim or an Englishman and so on. All the divisions have to be dropped because you and I are one biologically. When this is done we can feed the starving millions. If not, we will be wrangling to find out which is the better system, or the best set of ideas. So the starving man is left out. This does not mean that we should not organize to feed the many, the one. One has to think in terms of the world. The scientist can be put to work to feed, clothe and provide shelter for everybody. But scientists are also nationalists like you and me. If you are spreading this poison of separatism you are also contributing to this disaster. Separatism not only economically but psychologically as well; the organized separatism of religion or societies, etc. If you really felt that they are wrong, would you not stop them and thereby bring about a different world tomorrow? Nobody is worried about what is going to happen five hundred years hence. I want to be fed tomorrow, immediately and you could provide food, clothing and shelter if we all acted immediately. But unfortunately the crisis is far away from most of us or at least we think it is far away and therefore we are not faced with it. Nobody is going to give you peace, certainly not God, because we are not worthy of it. We have made this mess and we have to get out of it and we cannot get out of it through any system.

Question: More things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of. Mahatma Gandhi has wonderfully exemplified its efficacy in his daily life. If individuals without distraction and materialistic aggrandizement lift their hearts to God in penitent prayer, then the mercy of God will dispel the catastrophe that has overtaken the world. Is this not the right attitude to develop?

Krishnamurti: We must differentiate between prayer and meditation. What do we mean by prayer? Generally it means supplication or petition. You demand, beg, or ask from what you call God, something which you want. To put it plainly it means that you are in need and you pray. You are in suffering and you pray. You are mentally confused and you pray. That is, you petition or you supplicate somebody to tell you what to do. To whom are you praying? You say to God. But surely God or Truth is something unknown and which cannot be formulated. If you say I know God it is no longer God. God and Truth are not created. It must come to you and you cannot go to it and ask. When you ask you are creating it and therefore it ceases to be God or Truth. So before you ask, you must know whether you want peace from God, that is, Truth. When you yourself create this chaos in this world you look to another for help. So God cannot give you peace, because it is your fabrication. What is the good of praying? Is not then prayer an escape? Please do not bring personalities into it. Let us think about it directly. It does not matter who prays. Once a person in America came to see me and he said that he had prayed God to give him a refrigerator and he said that he had the refrigerator. But you pay for it in the end. If you want peace you will have it, but it will not be peace, it will only be decay, stagnation and regimentation. Peace is something very dynamic which is creative and you cannot have something creative through supplication. But prayer is completely different from meditation. A man who prays can never understand what is meditation, because he is concerned with gain. Meditation is a process of understanding. Understanding is not a result and it is not something you gain. It is a process of self-discovery. That means meditation is an awareness of your whole process of living. Meditation is a

process of understanding, the process of your whole being not only a part of it, and that means that you have to be aware of everything that you are doing. It is not concentration. You take a picture and you focus your attention on that. That is comparatively easy. That is exclusive, you exclude all thoughts and you focus your attention on one point. Surely that is not meditation. Meditation is an awareness constantly becoming deeper and deeper as a result of clearly seeing through the many layers of consciousness. It is like a pool that is still when the process is over. When the problem ceases through awareness the solution becomes stillness. It cannot be made quiet. So prayer, concentration, meditation, are entirely different things and he who prays can never know what meditation is; neither he who concentrates can ever know what meditation is. For meditation is spontaneous and therefore it requires spontaneity and not a regimented mind. Spontaneity comes into being when there is awareness, awareness in which there is no condemnation, no judgment and no identification. If you go deeper and deeper and let it flow freely it becomes meditation, in which the thinker is the thought and there is no division between the thinker and the thought.

Question: You deride the Brahmins. Have they not played an important part in the culture of India.

Krishnamurti: Perhaps they have. But what of it? Surely such a question indicates hereditary pride. Does it not? It is like saying that I was something marvellous in my past incarnation but now I am a boot-black. This idea that you are the exclusive race of Brahmins, this idea that you have a master-creed which cannot be handed down, is detrimental to society. So what matters is not whether you are a Brahmin or not, but what you are now, not what you were in the past. Originally every society in the world had a group of people who were devoted to something real. You call them Brahmins, somebody else calls them Hebrews, Christians, and so on. But what they were essentially concerned with was the pursuit of the real, irrespective of what the society around was doing. By what name they are called does not matter. It is they who gave to society, culture, and not the people who were embroiled in

society whether politicians, lawyers or warmongers. These do not make society, they do not make culture, but the people who really preach culture are those who are peaceful and not the politicians. So in the past they were such people who were not concerned with ambition, with power, with position, with property, with systems. Not only here but right through the world. There were few who were not concerned, here, and in China there were large groups, and practically everywhere throughout history. And here now, what has happened to the hereditary Brahmins, who are supposed to guide society, to help man to think rightly? They have become merchants, they have become lawyers, they have become politicians. Do you think culture can exist on that kind of basis? On a structure that is really destructive to men?

So, what matters is, not the past, but the result of the past which is the present. To understand the past you have to look through the present, psychologically and factually. The present is the passage of the past to the future. If you do not change in the present, the future will be biased, which means chaos. So we are concerned with the present, not with the Brahmins of old times who were concerned with something far greater than merely grabbing for money, for position, and coding up systems. So since the present is of the highest importance, what are we doing? In what way are we changing ourselves and guiding culture, not Indian culture or Christian culture, but human culture. It is only by setting up peaceful thinking in daily life that we can realize Truth. There is a responsibility for those who are not themselves immediately concerned with food, clothing, and shelter. It is your responsibility to ensure food and clothing for the naked and the starving; instead you are intellectually indulging in verbiage. You must completely shed your opinions and that means revolution in your mind.

Question: You have attained illumination, but what about us, the millions?

Krishnamurti: So, what about you? You and I are the millions, but are we aware of it? The moment we are in despair, we are confused, but who can save us, not the illumined, I assure you, not the leader, not the church, not

the temple, not the politician. You are the only person who can save yourself and none other. It is like a man who is in sorrow. If he is unaware of his sorrow, he goes to another and talks about saving the world. If he is aware of his sorrow, of his constant loneliness, emptiness, strife, pains, struggle, then he begins with himself, and he is not concerned about who is illumined and who is not illumined. He is concerned with his own transformation, with his own regeneration, and that is what matters, not the leader, not the follower, but you; because you yourself are the mass, the life; and life is painful and you feel anxious when you do not understand it, but you can understand it only through yourself, and not through another.

October 26, 1947

III

I would like to continue from where I left off last Sunday. Perhaps those of you who have followed the discussions, those who have followed what I have been saying seriously, will remember that I was trying to show the relationship between the individual and society, how society having been created by the individual smothers the individual through systems, through organizations, through religion and so on. I would like to continue from where I left off because I think it is very important to realize not only verbally but really very seriously and profoundly, the relationship between the individual and society, as well as the transformation of society and the regeneration of the individual. There is hope in man, not in society, not in systems—organized religious systems—but in you, and in me. I think this is fairly obvious. We must try to know what is happening in the world and not merely accept a formula, a system because there is no hope in them. So it is very important to realize the relationship between the individual and society. Is not society the result of one individual's relationship with another? Your relationship with another creates the society which in turn brings

into being the State. The State by itself is not a separate entity. It is the outcome of your relationship with others. So it is from society that State comes into being.

Though you assert that relationship is based on brotherhood, love and religious ideas and so on, if you really analyse it very carefully and deeply you will see that it is based on sensate values, that is, the relationship is the product of sensory values, values made either by the hand or by the mind. Sensory values are not eternal values. That we shall discuss presently. So the relationship based on sensory values has produced in the world, wars, catastrophes, the chaos which you see throughout the world. This relationship between you and another has bred individual enterprise; and opposed to that there has come into being collective action. If you examine both, you will see that society is based on sensory values; whether of the right or of the left it is ultimately based on sensory values; and neither the right nor the left has brought happiness to man. That is, whether it is organized — society of the left or of the right, man's happiness has not come into being.

Man is in despair, confused and in sorrow. So the problem is this, does man's happiness — thought, action, mind — does it lie in sensate values upon which our society, either of the left or of the right is based? Though the right produces religion, worship, etc., yet if you look at it very deeply, you will see that ultimately it denies man's happiness because it produces wars, regimentation and an education that merely shows you what to think, not how to think; yet surely the organized society of the left also denies man's happiness because it is regimented. So, does man's happiness, the happiness which is yours and mine, does it lie in things made by the hand and by the mind? And this is what we are all going to discover, through self-knowledge; it is you, and not somebody else who is going to tell you where your happiness lies. Your creative being, creative activity and your joys and your happiness are in sensory values. Through self-knowledge we can discover what is the truth and right happiness and whether our happiness lies in things made by the hand and by the mind.

Now, what is self-knowledge? Surely it cannot be learned through books. Surely it is not the assertion of another.

You have to know the total process of your whole being, that is, to be aware of everything that you are :—thoughts, feeling and action. Being aware, not by becoming aware, of what you are, that is the very beginning of self-knowledge. Without self-knowledge I do not see how there can be any thinking at all. Since you are the world and your relationship with another is society, without a revolutionary change in you there can be no hope. How to understand yourself is of primary importance. "Transform society" is one of our catch-phrases, an easy assertion, that we must do something about the world as though the world were so different from ourselves. We have created this horror, these wars, this mad chaos in the world at the present time and we cannot transform it if we do not know how to think about the problem. We cannot think about the problem unless we are aware of it. And you cannot be aware of it outside of yourself. You have created this, therefore you should become aware of yourselves and not of others. Therefore the confusion has to be cleared within your mind, which does not mean you must wait till all the confusion in yourself is cleared before you act.

So the problem of which we are well aware is how to transform the world, to bring happiness, to bring order, to bring peace. It must begin with us, that is with you and me, not merely by saying 'I must begin', but in action, by becoming aware of what we are doing, of all the process and the repetition of ideas, and the absurdities in which we sometimes indulge, our class and communal divisions, national and racial divisions. All that has to be altered, has it not, before there can be fundamental changes in the world? And I do not think we realize what an extraordinary crisis this is. As I have said in my previous talks, it is not an ordinary economic crisis but an extraordinary crisis. A crisis like this happens only very rarely and we are all confronted with one of the rarest of catastrophes and confusions. And we all are approaching it with formulae, with systems, which is only blind thinking, whether the system is of the right or of the left. What we need is a complete revolution in thought, that is, in values and you cannot create values except by awakening the individual, not the individual in opposition to the mass. And as the individual's awakening is limited by narrow prejudicial activities, he cannot transform

or regenerate himself, that is, the mass; and that can only be done by becoming aware of yourself, of whatever you do from the least important to the most profound. If you are not aware you must find out why you are not aware. When you walk down the streets you are aware of the poverty of the people, of the ill-fed families and of the utter callousness of everyone. But we have created this, you and I have created what is about us. It has not come into being by some mysterious charm, and since we are not aware of it how can we transform it? Surely that is the obvious beginning. Is it not? It looks simple and yet the most profound beginning is to begin with ourselves, which is the most difficult. We can always reform others, but it is very difficult to transform ourselves (Laughter).

I know, Sirs, you laugh and that laughter has very little significance, it does not mean very much. I know that to most of us life has very little significance. We are all trying to solve the world's problem. What is happening in the Punjab, has happened in Germany. What is happening is a slow process of regimentation, even in England which has stood for the liberty of the individual. We are not aware of what is happening in America and China. You read about all of this because unfortunately it is one of our pet habits to read papers. We have become so dull and I think that is where our difficulty lies. We must revivify and quicken our whole sensitivity. But you cannot be sensitive by merely saying that you must be sensitive. You become sensitive, when you become aware of yourself in action, in thought and in feeling. Surely hope or God, or whatever name you like to give it is to be found not in religion, not in systems but in trying to discover truth in every little thing. Truth is not far away but very near, only if we knew how to look for it, but we do not look for it because we are not aware. So what is of primary importance is to be aware, so choicelessly, so penetratingly aware of every thought, every feeling that is revealed.

Question: In a recent article by a famous correspondent it was stated that wisdom and personal example do not solve the world's problem. What do you say?

Krishnamurti: As there are many things involved in this particular question we must analyse it carefully. First

of all we are persuaded or told what to think by famous correspondents, because correspondents, like you, have axes to grind. So, being very clever and good at words the correspondent writes and we read because we are educated, and what we read becomes the truth. We have stopped thinking but we absorb and so, famous correspondents become very important in our daily activities, also what they think and what they do. First of all we should be aware of everything: one has to be extremely alert, not to absorb other people's ideas and demands. The correspondent says that wisdom and personal examples are not enough to solve the world's problem. Neither do I think wisdom and personal example will save the world. The correspondent asks invariably for political action either of the left or of the right, based on a certain set of ideals—religious, economic or social.

Now what does personal example mean? Invariably it leads to imitation. You have an ideal and you conform to it and naturally conformity, imitation, regimentation of thought can never solve the world's problems. Therefore personal example in a great crisis becomes of very little significance. Wisdom cannot be realized through personal example. Wisdom is a thing that is living, real and constantly moving. It is not in a fixed place; it is not learned through books. What is necessary at the present time is not example, but revolution in thinking, creative thinking. And that revolution cannot take place or be gained by following a few leaders. It can only be gained through you, the individual. So neither personal example, nor political action based on a system or on an authority is going to save the world. That has been tried over and over again. Man puts his faith in a system, in the party, in a leader and each one of these has invariably failed. We merely returned to the exploitation of man in a different form, in different degrees, on a different level. Whether the State exploits man or man exploits man is all the same. The problem is not solved by the State or by examples.

The problem is our problem, because we no longer think creatively, but are following patterns, in a regimented way. We have brought about this world-chaos and therefore personal example can never save mankind.

So there must be a creative revolution in thinking and that is extremely difficult. And because it is difficult we look to somebody else, to the example, to the leader. What do I mean by creative thinking? Do we think at all or do we merely respond to a certain set of conditions? Is that thinking? Because you are a Hindu, you are conditioned in a certain manner or if a Muslim, a Buddhist, or whatever it be, your response is to that particular conditioning. Surely that is not thinking. You have a certain conditioning and you respond to that. You think that you are thinking. There can be revolution in thinking only when the man is free from conditioning, not only the conscious conditioning, but the many layers of consciousness in which conditioning exists and to become liberated from that conditioning is revolutionary thinking. And that means you have to cease to be a Brahmin or a Muslim or a Hindu or a Christian. You have to transcend all fallacies, class divisions and that is the problem now. I know you will easily agree with me in all this. You will shake your head in assent. You will probably come next Sunday and the many following Sundays and yet you will go on in the same routine because you are conditioned. If you do change, what will your neighbours say! You might even lose your job and therefore you will go on shaking your head and the world will go on more and more miserably and you will go on talking about changing the world.

So the start is not in the world of which you are unaware, but in you. The world's problem can be solved if you are aware of the catastrophe and the misery in yourself, the confusion which exists in you and therefore in the world. Political action is comparatively easy. To organize the distribution of food for mankind is comparatively easy. There is a need to clothe man, shelter him and give him food. We all know that. Every school-boy knows it. But what is the result? It is merely book-knowledge. Because the boy is conditioned, because he cannot free himself from his conditioning, it remains merely book-knowledge without action. That is why, we must break through our conditioning and all the degradations, the degenerative qualities that exist. I assure you that is the only way out, and that also means that personal examples are of very little significance in a world-crisis of this kind, but

what is of the highest importance is what you are, your thinking, your feeling, your action now.

Question: What do you mean when you say that we use the present as a passage?

Krishnamurti: Last Sunday I said that we use the present as a passage to the future. We use the present as a means of achieving some result, whether it is a psychological result or a personal result, changing oneself to become something. We use the present as a means of the past for the future; that is, to answer the question, the present is the result of the past. Surely that is obvious. What you think is based on the past, your being is founded on the past. Now thought without understanding the past, goes through the present into the future. So the future is the past continuing through the present, and it is the result of the past, it can only be understood through the present. The psychoanalysts look to the past to find difficulties, the conditioning, the complex, and so on. But to understand the past, the present which is the past must be understood. That is, through the present is the past. Past is not unrelated to the present. So to understand the past the door is the present, which is also the door to the future. That is, to understand the significance of the past the present must be understood and not sacrificed for the future. There are political groups of the left and also of the right who say: "Sacrifice the present for the future. It does not matter what happens to man in the present but we will lead him to a marvellous future." As though they knew what the future is going to be! This idea of sacrificing the present for the future has thus led man to disaster, into chaos and misery. Religious people also use the present as a passage to the future. That is, you say: "In my next incarnation I will do something, but nothing now. Give me a chance." That is sacrificing the present, surely. Surely eternity is the present, the timeless is now and to understand the timeless you cannot approach it through time. Yet, you are using time, that is, the past, the present and the future as a means of realizing the immeasurable, the timeless. So one must be aware of what this political fallacy of sacrificing the present for the future is, and one must be

aware also of this idea that the future is different from the present.

If you do not change now you will never change. Because you are continuing the present, understanding, wisdom is in the present not in the future. Wisdom is being, which is the present, which is now, and the present can be understood when the mind understands the past and thus becomes psychologically aware of the whole content of our being now, of what you are now; and therefore to understand the now, you must look to the past, because your thought is based on the past. Surely that is obvious, is it not? You cannot think without the past and to understand the past, examine what you are now, be aware of what you are now and becoming aware of what you are now, you will see you are using the present as a passage to get somewhere, interpreting the present and knowing its significance conditioned by the past. So if you use time as a means to the timeless you will never find the timeless because the means creates the end. If you use wrong means you will produce the wrong end. War is a wrong means to peace and while we are talking of peace, nations are preparing for war. The means is the end and the end is not dissociated from the means. So if you would understand the timeless, what is bound in time—that is, the past, the present and the future—must free itself, and that is extremely arduous. It demands constant awareness of every thought and every feeling and becoming aware how it is conditioned, how it is caught up in us.

Question: The communists say that the rulers of Indian states, the zamindars and the capitalists are the chief exploiters of the nation and they should be liquidated in order to secure food, clothing and shelter for all. Mahatma Gandhi says that the rulers, zamindars and the capitalists are the trustees of the persons under their control and influence and therefore they may be allowed to remain and function. What do you say?

Krishnamurti: It is extremely confusing, what is happening in the world. We give more importance to what other people say, and do not mind what we think. It is really odd. Wherever you go, in America, in England, and even in Damascus and here, you are fully acquainted with

what everyone is saying, and yet do you know what you think? You will repeat what this political leader, that philosopher says, but will that save mankind? What another thinks, has it any significance? So the capitalists, the leaders and others say one thing contradicting or occasionally agreeing. So it is what they think that matters but not what you and I think! Do let us find out what we think apart from all our leaders, apart from our gurus, apart from all our systems and philosophies or all our groups whether of the left or of the right, let us think of the problem as though we are facing it for the first time. Let us view it as though we had never read a book. Surely that is the only way to solve the problem. So we are not discussing what the experts, the authorities, the leaders think, but what you and I think.

How will you get rid of the zamindars and capitalists? How does one become a zamindar or a maharajah? By exploiting people. To gather more than what one needs, leads to exploitation. Does it not? Merely because you need a certain amount of food, clothing and shelter is no reason for becoming the means by which some men use others for their personal satisfaction either economically, socially, or psychologically. Therefore to use man to gain power, position and authority becomes exploitation. So exploitation is the problem and not the zamindars. They are like you. If you had the chance you would be zamindars. If you had the chance you would be capitalists. Because you have something, you want more. You lose your generosity, the moment you climb up the ladder. So the problem is exploitation; to stop it, is the problem, is it not? And the capitalists, zamindars, etc., are trustees! Good God, they are trustees! Do you know what 'trustees' means? Trust means love, and trustees, people who love man. To seek position for oneself, does it mean love for man? How can you love and at the same time exploit people? See, please, I am not taking sides. So do not become aggressive. The problem is much more profound than merely to say that they are trustees or not. First of all the problem is how easily you are persuaded. Let us think it out together now. The problem is exploitation; can exploitation cease while there is individual enterprise or must there be collective action? We know what individual enterprise has brought into the world and we also know what State exploitation can do. Both are equally ruth-

less and brutal; the latter perhaps more so, because there is no appeal and the State is run by the few. They also seek power and position. They also exploit man. Perhaps they may organize collective food, clothing and shelter for everybody. But they will exploit something which is much more important, your mind, your being, which means what you are thinking. Surely that is also exploitation, to control what you say and think. So exploitation is a very complex problem and as I said the moment we stock beyond what is essential, we exploit not only physiologically, but, psychologically also. The more clothes, the more shelter, the more ideas, you are acquiring, the greater the exploitation. Let us analyse it. The moment you acquire, the moment you become important, the moment the emphasis is laid on you as an entity acquiring, there must be exploitation, which does not mean that we should not organize for the welfare of the whole. But if the organizer is concerned with acquisition, then surely organizing is a means of exploitation, which we have seen happen over and over again.

Can man live in relationship with another without acquisition, without position? Surely that is the problem put in a different way. Can we live in a society without acquiring more and more property, for property represents power, position and security and you are not willing to limit your needs? Individual enterprise and other causes have contributed to horrors, so people of the left say: liquidate. But liquidation is not the solution, surely. Man may not exploit through means of production, but the State will. The means of securing food, clothing and shelter is denied by psychological acquisitions, which again is seen in everyday life. But this desire for acquisition is a means of security. The more you have the safer you are, at least you think you are. But is there such a thing as security? Because we have sought security irrespective of anything we possess, we have created this chaos. Each person is seeking security and because each person wants to be more secure still, another group says we must have collective security. That means exploiting man not merely for physical security, but exploiting man for much more profound things.

So we come back to the question whether acquisition, psychological or physical, can be voluntarily relinquished. If you

do not voluntarily relinquish it, it will be taken out of your hands; that is, if you do not physically or psychologically relinquish the desire to acquire, society is going to deprive you of everything and you will be made into a tool. That is what is happening. Society now is based on industry and therefore the labour must be organized and also controlled, that is you and I will be controlled. Therefore the state will control you and tell you what you should do and should not do. This is coming whether you like it or not. And if you really relinquish this desire to possess, to acquire, then morally, we will create a new society not based on any compulsion but that requires a great deal of active intelligence. It also means that you must begin with yourselves. But since you are apathetic, lazy, you will be directed and compelled and there is no solution in that way. The solution lies in understanding what exploitation is, not only physical exploitation but the psychological as well; and if one does not understand psychological exploitation, one fails to realize that the more we desire security, position, the nearer we are to loneliness, to poverty, to degradation. This is an immense question and an immense problem. It is to be understood very deeply because we do not lay emphasis on sensate values only.

We live for intangible things like power. This greed for power comes because we do not understand ourselves. To understand ourselves requires a great deal of work, a great deal of thought and patience, the patience to look at things as they are.

Question: Are your teachings intended only for the sanyasis or for all of us with families and their responsibilities?

Krishnamurti: Surely what I am saying is meant for all: for those who have renounced the world and for those who live in the world; for he who has renounced is still in the world because he is in the world of his own making, just as the worldly person is in the world of his own desires. Both are held in bondage whether the bondage of the family, of the sensate or the bondage of the mind, and what I am saying applies to both because freedom is not one's creation. God or truth does not lie either in things made by the hand or in the things made by the mind. One has to transcend them, go above and beyond the passions, the envies, the greed, the ill-

will, the worldliness and beyond the things that man invents and creates. Then only shall we find what is truth. And we do find it at rare moments, moments when the mind is not thinking of itself, when the mind is tranquil. This happens very rarely. When you are unconsciously wandering in the streets, when you are not thinking, spontaneously there is this extraordinary state in feeling—a fleeting revelation uninvited, unexpressed but which if you once have experienced it you want to regain. Therefore you are caught again in memory. in want.

After all the man who has a family is in a terrible position, is he not? Look at yourselves. Because of confusion in the world and sadness and despair in the world you are concerned with what is going to happen to your children. You want them to be secure, safely married and settled. The greater the confusion, the more you want security. That is, you want to push your responsibility on to somebody else, and what happens? You are unwilling to face the real issues, you call it responsibilities, whether it be love or any other thing. Likewise the man who has renounced the world is caught up in the images of his own mind. For him it is not different because he is heavy with his own fancies, his own dreams made of his own creation. He is born with them as you are with yours and so what is the real issue? How to live in the world when greed, when envy, when illwill, when those passions that destroy men are rampant. Surely we can live in the world without greed. Yes sir, you may laugh, you can live in the world without greed. To live so, you require a great deal of alertness, a great deal of thought, not to follow leaders, but to become aware of yourself. Then the family has a different significance because love comes in. Without love, family has no meaning and most of us, if I may say so, have not loved when we have families. If we understood our relationship with another real transformation would come. Then there would be love which will bring into being regeneration and a new world.

Question: You may have heard of the awful tragedy that has taken place and is even now taking place in the Punjab. Will the individual action based on right thinking and self-knowledge by the few who are capable of such action be significant to solve this Punjab problem?

Krishnamurti: What has happened in Punjab has also happened in Germany, in Europe. It has happened all over the world. It is not a peculiar Indian problem. This tragedy has taken place because of our national and religious bigotry. We are Hindus or we are Muslims, we are not human beings. We are labels, whether Germans or English, Japanese or Chinese and that is why the tragedy has taken place. I am afraid this is going to take place all over the world because nationalistic spirit is still rampant. Surely, till that ceases you are going to have war—economic, religious, psychological and all the rest of it. So the problem is not peculiar to Punjab but it is general. You only understand it by making it particular, by making it local. You are responsible for it and you have to transform yourselves. Because you have insisted for centuries on being either a Hindu or a Muslim as though what you call yourself mattered very much. We are labelled and we are unable to understand the sensitivity of other human beings and we are slaves to nationalism, to property and therefore we are willing to kill another in the name of freedom, in the name of God. To make it direct you have to change. Have you not? You have to completely stop nationalism. We have to stop the waving of the flag. We have to cease to be a Hindu or a Musalman or a German or an American and cease to think in those terms and think in different categories. I know you will agree with me, yet you will go home and still be a Hindu or a Christian and God knows what else. You will continue your *poojas*, your Brahmanic tradition, you will go to the temples and function along the same routine. Yet we talk of brotherliness, being Hindus, and the tradition says that you must love each other as brothers. So what matters is that you should break up your conditioning. Not here, you have to break it up at home, at your political meetings. And then you will find how extraordinarily difficult it is. Your mothers, your sisters will cry and to please them you will have to become a hypocrite. You do not know how serious it is. You may be insensitive to it and you do not know what is happening. Preparations are going on for the third catastrophe which will be worse than ever before, and here we are discussing whether we are Brahmins or not. Is it not too childish? When you will be in a crisis will you bother about what caste you are, what nation-

ality you are, whether you belong to the left or to the right? When we do, we are not aware of the crisis. We are controlled by our labels and that is our difficulty. To reawaken ourselves we have to become sensitive to the whole issue.

Question: You say discipline is opposed to freedom. But is discipline necessary for freedom?

Krishnamurti: As this is a difficult problem, we have to consider thoroughly the implications of this question. A wrong means will produce a wrong end. Therefore right means must be employed for right ends. If you are disciplined, regimented, you will not produce freedom but a regimentation, a disciplined conditioning. It is obvious, is it not? So the means matters much more than the end. So, if you discipline your mind according to a pattern, which is the means, then you are bound to produce an end which is patterned after the means. But you will say: I must organize my daily life otherwise I can do nothing. I must condition myself to do my daily duties. I must organize the day. Now, what do you organize for? Why do you discipline yourself at all? To get things done, is it not? That is you arrange your day to achieve a certain result. That is one kind of discipline. You arrange it mechanically, discipline yourself mechanically to achieve a certain result. Now the same mentality is carried over. In order to achieve a result you discipline yourself more and more. You say, you must be happy, you must find God, you must know; and you employ methods in order to achieve that result. You think happiness is truth or God, that it is an end to be achieved. That it is fixed, as though happiness were fixed, something to be done mechanically, something to be gained and you say after establishing it you have the means to discipline yourself. Now, can a disciplined mind, in the sense I am using the word 'disciplined', be regimented, compelled through a means to an end? The means creates the end. The end is made by you. Therefore you are conditioning the end. Can a mind which is disciplined understand freedom? For a political man you may have to discipline yourself in order to achieve a result and in that process your mind becomes dull. Because party discipline is important, you sacrifice individual thinking in order to achieve a result. So you train yourself to be disciplined in order to achieve a result.

There is no real thinking but the mind is merely hitched to a van you call the political machine and you cease to be a thinker and you are disciplined to function effectively. What you say is: I will discipline, control myself according to a pattern, in order to be free. How absurd it sounds! To put it differently, need you go through drunkenness to become sober? As means is the end, you must begin by understanding why it is necessary to be disciplined, and what it implies. Freedom is not a result. Freedom begins when you are aware, and that awareness does not only apply to discipline, but to the whole process of living. So freedom can only come into being when the mind is free, when it is not conditioned by a pattern, by a discipline. When do you discover anything? When you are spontaneous, when you are absolutely free, not when you are bound and blind. To discover the real God, there must be freedom and you cannot be free to discover when your mind is trained after a pattern, trained according to a desire. Which does not mean that mind must be vagrant. When you become aware of the vagrancy of the mind, of the wanderings of the mind there is already freedom. You speak of discipline, the means to establish the end. Yet the end is not the real, because it is created by the mind and what you gain is not the real. Truth must come to you and you cannot go to truth and to receive truth there must be freedom to think clearly, deeply, profoundly. There must be choiceless awareness, not condemnation nor identification, but awareness. You will find that there are different ways of looking at discipline, Discipline prevents thinking and it is only in spontaneity that any freedom can be real, that the immeasurable can be known.

November 2, 1947

IV

I would request you to listen to these talks, not so much with the idea of learning, but letting what I am saying take root. If it is true it will take root unconsciously and if it is not true it will fall off and so you do not have to bother.

predominating value. In other words, secondary values when given consuming importance bring disaster and misery as they are doing now in the world. So why is there no greater value though all the books, the sacred books, say that there is a greater value? You must seek why; have you not tried it? If we did seek why, where has it led us to? Again to class division. Though you are seeking God and all the rest of it, the result is still division, division between the Hindu, the Buddhist, the Christian, the Muslim and so on. So when the mind seeks security, certainty, there can be no greater value than the sensate. After all, acquisition and class division are psychological factors. They are not materialistic values. They are psychological demands. So psychologically when we are seeking security it only creates values that are made by the hand or by the mind and therefore there can be no greater value and so sensate values become all important. Obviously we must have legislation and some kind of control but that does not solve the problem because revolution after revolution has come and we still stay the same. We are in the same misery and in the same confusion and nothing has been solved.

So, how is the greater value to be found? This is significant. If I am really interested in something greater, I will not give such significance to the secondary, to the lesser. As I have not found a greater interest, the secondary becomes all important and how am I to find the greater? I can only find it by understanding the psychological demand for security. I think this is the problem which we have to face, not the problem of food, clothing and shelter, because even when we have food, clothing and shelter, we still demand security for our inner needs. So, when we seek security we will have to ask, is there any security? Is there psychological security? We are all seeking it. We want to have food, clothing, shelter, but we also want to find security in names, class divisions, property, beliefs, definite ideas. This is the way in which the mind constantly seeks to be secure, to be certain, and we have assumed that there is such a thing as security and on it we are building our whole civilization, the whole structure of our thoughts, religious thoughts as well as those of every day existence. We have never asked ourselves, is there security, is there certainty? If there is not we will have to alter our

whole existence. So, the problem then is not food, clothing and shelter for it can be solved.

When the mind is seeking security, it must create the lesser values which are sensate values; and then sensate values become all important. So, is there security? Is there psychological certainty? You are going to find it out. We can only find it out through self-knowledge. So, I come back to that point again with a different approach. That is, as long as the mind is seeking security, when it is seeking psychological security, it only creates sensate values, the known values, sensory values, and it is caught in these values. But, if the mind is enquiring whether there is security, then sensate values become of less significance. I may tell you there is no security or somebody else can tell you there is security; but that will have no significance. But if you can discover it for yourself, then it will become extraordinarily clear, which is not the result of our own projection. So, self-knowledge is important in the sense that while you explore your own mind you begin to discover fundamentally and basically whether such a thing as security exists, whether reality is certainty; and self-knowledge has an extraordinary creative significance, if we treat it as an experiment, and not try to achieve a result; if we experiment with ourselves and live experimentally then every relationship becomes a process of self-revelation; if I am related to you and in daily contact with you I am being revealed to myself, the way I think, the way I feel and act; if I am observant and aware of that relationship in daily life, the process of my thinking, my meditations, my demands become revealed to me. But I can only have self-knowledge if I am aware. When I am aware I can see that one of the major difficulties in relationship—whether it be relationship with one or with many—is our desire to be secure, because after all can relationship exist on uncertainty? Can you feel insecure with your wife and your children? Because as soon as you feel insecure, you begin to inquire. The moment you are certain you go to sleep. Thus, self-knowledge becomes extraordinarily significant; when one begins to enquire whether there is any certainty, and question the mind which is ever seeking, pursuing the known.

I do not know if you have observed the process of your

thinking; but if you have, you will see that your thought is always moving from the known to the known, or to an unknown of its own creation which it then pursues until it becomes the worship of God. You have created God because it is the ultimate security; and if you observe very carefully your own way of thinking, your own feeling, you will see that they are absorbed in security. Yet truly, it is in uncertainty, in freedom, that you can discover what freedom is, not in certainty, nor in possessiveness, nor in the divisions of beliefs or of names. Property, belief have become all important because we have pursued certainty through sensate values, sensory values that the mind can create or the hand can create, because in them there seems to be security. But, if you went deeply into the whole problem of security, then sensory values would be of very small importance.

Question: Will you please explain further what you mean by meditation?

Krishnamurti: First of all let us see exactly what takes place, what the problem is, then we can have understanding. Only then will we find the answer. What do we generally mean by meditation? Let us examine what happens when we meditate. We are not condemning it. We are not judging it. We are merely examining what we actually do when we meditate because if we understand the problem we can understand the solution, the answer to it.

So what do we do when we sit down and meditate? First of all, whenever we give importance to a belief we erect a barrier. You do it because you have been told to do it. Secondly, if you sit down and meditate, your mind wanders hopelessly all over the place. Because you have been told, that your mind is subtle and that you must concentrate on one idea and exclude all other ideas, you spend your time in conflict, trying to concentrate on one idea, while all the time your mind flits all over the place. If you sit in front of a picture you try to concentrate on that picture, or else on a word or on a phrase or on a quality. Because of your desire to be secure, you concentrate on something positive, like a picture, or a phrase, or an idea, or a quality. The idea has generally been formulated by the mind or taken out of a book. This is what we do and this is the actual picture, is

unknowable, isn't it? What you seek is the unknowable. If you experience it and merely live in the experience—all experiences are of the past—then it is not the real. So, for example you feel an extraordinary clarity, a vision of beauty and truth. The mind records this experience in memory and clings to it, thus breaking away from the unknown. Memory becomes a hindrance to the unknowable. How then would you find out that which is not conceivable, that which cannot be formulated, that which is immeasurable, the real? This is the problem, in meditation, is it not? Meditation is not a prayer, it is not a problem of concentration, we have gone into that. Can meditation—which is the result of the known, of the past—discover the unknowable, the unknown? Can my mind, which is the result of the known, of the past, understand, experience the unknowable, the timeless, the eternal? What is the answer? It can only know the eternal, the timeless when it is not caught in time. The mind can know the truth only when the mind is free from time, the known. So how can the mind which is the result of the past, free itself from an idea, a phrase, from devotion to a superior entity, all of which are inventions of the mind? It is obvious that when the mind suggests a superior entity, it is already the known entity. I do not know if you will see the implication in this.

So, the problem then is not how to meditate, which is really a wrong question. 'How' implies method. Method is the known and the known can only lead you to the known. The means creates the end. If the means is the known the end is the known.

So, the problem is the mind which moves from the known to the known. You study to find the unknowable, the eternal, the timeless. The mind cannot see the real unless it frees itself from the known. What is the known? The accumulated memory is constantly gathering ideas, possessions or distinctions. Can mind free itself from its own creations? Can mind, which is the result of time, free itself from time? Because when it is itself free from time, the timeless is. Mind is not searching for the timeless. It does not know what the timeless is. So, how can the mind free itself from time, from the past, the present and the future? It can free itself only from time, from the present, by being aware of everything, of all that we are doing now, of all thinking, of all feeling, by

being aware now and not tomorrow. For, the present is the door to time, to the understanding of time and the present exists in what you are thinking, not in the time indicated by the clock, the time-table, or your routine. But in becoming aware of what you are thinking now you will discover why you are thinking and what you are thinking. That is, if you are aware, you will begin to see that you condemn, judge, identify or find excuses. But that does not help you to know what you are thinking and what is the cause of your thinking and your reaction to it. So, it is in knowing what you are thinking, in the constant awareness of what you are thinking, feeling, doing, that you will find the beginning of self-knowledge, not only knowledge of your self-conscious, but also of all the hidden activities. This is the beginning of self-knowledge and therefore self-knowledge is the beginning of meditation and there can be no meditation without self-knowledge. To meditate there must be self-knowledge.

So, the question 'How to meditate' is a wrong question because it merely asks for a method, the known, a technique which is the known, to find the unknowable. See how ridiculous it is. The means creates the end and if the means is the known then the end also is the known and therefore it is not the unknowable, the timeless. So the beginning of meditation is the beginning of self-knowledge. That is, through awareness the mind begins to be aware of its own activities and to know the whole process of the mind is not a question of time. But, if you begin to be aware, choicelessly, that is without condemnation, without justification, without identification, which is extremely difficult, then self-knowledge becomes extremely creative. After all that which is creative is creation, the Real.

Question: I am beginning to realize that I am very lonely. What am I to do? (Laughter)

Krishnamurti: I wonder why you laugh. Do you laugh because you despise loneliness or because you think that it is something which does not concern you? You must be so busy with social activities that you cannot bother about yourself, nor feel your loneliness. Is that the reason why we laugh? It will be very interesting, Sirs, to find out within yourself why you laugh because then you will open the way

to self-knowledge and if you pursue self-knowledge really, ardently, it will lead you to amazing heights and depths, to extraordinary joy, tribulation, which you will never know otherwise.

The questioner wants to know, why he feels loneliness? Do you know what loneliness means and are you aware of it? I doubt it very much because we have smothered ourselves in activities, in books, in relationships, in ideas which really prevent us from being aware of loneliness. So, what do we mean by loneliness? It is a sense of being empty, of having nothing, of being extraordinarily uncertain, with no anchorage anywhere. It is not despair, nor hopelessness, but a sense of void, a sense of emptiness and a sense of frustration. I am sure we have all felt it, the happy and the unhappy, the very, very active and those who are addicted to knowledge. They all know this. The sense of real inexhaustible pain, a pain that cannot be covered up though we do try to cover it up.

So, let us approach again this problem to see what is actually taking place, to see what you do when you feel lonely. You try to escape from your feeling of loneliness, you try to pick up a book, you follow some leader, or you go to a cinema, or you become socially very, very active, or you go and worship and pray, or you paint, or you write a poem about loneliness. That is what is actually taking place. Becoming aware of loneliness, the pain of it, the extraordinary and fathomless fear of it, you seek an escape, and that escape becomes more important and therefore your activities, your knowledge, your gods, your radios all become important. Don't they? I said, when you give importance to secondary values, they lead you to misery and chaos; and the secondary values inevitably are the sensate values and modern civilization based on these gives you this escape—escape through your job, escape through your family, escape through your name, escape through your studies, escape through painting, etc.; all our culture is based on that escape. Our civilization is founded on that and that is a fact.

Have you ever tried to be alone? When you do, you will feel how extraordinarily difficult it is and how extraordinarily intelligent we must be to be alone, because the mind will not let you be alone. The mind becomes restless, it

busies itself with escapes. So what is it that we are doing? We try to fill this extraordinary void with the known. We discover how to be active, how to be social; we know how to study, how to turn on the radio. So we are filling that thing which we do not know, with the things we know. We try to fill that emptiness with various kinds of knowledge, relationship or things. With these three we are trying to fill it. Is that not so? That is our process, that is our existence. Now when you realize what you are doing, do you still think you can fill that void? You have tried every means of filling this void of loneliness. Have you succeeded in filling it? You have tried cinemas and you did not succeed and therefore you go after your gurus, your books or you become socially very active. Have you succeeded in filling it or have you merely covered it up? If you have merely covered it up, it is still there. Therefore, it will come back and if you are able to escape altogether then you are locked up in an asylum or you become very, very dull. That is what is happening in the world.

Can this emptiness, this void be filled? If not, can we run away from it, escape from it? And if we have experienced and found one escape to be of no value, are not therefore all other escapes of no value? Therefore it does not matter whether you fill the emptiness with this or with that. Meditation is also an escape. So it does not matter much that you change your escape.

How then will you find what to do about this loneliness? You can only find what to do when you have stopped escaping. Is not that so? That is, when you are willing to face what is, which means you must not turn on the radio, which means you must turn your back to civilization, then that loneliness comes to an end because it is completely transformed. It is no longer loneliness. Because if you understand what is, then what is, is the real. Because the mind is continuously avoiding, escaping, refusing to see what is, it creates its own hindrances. Because we have ever so many hindrances that are preventing us from seeing, we do not understand what is and therefore we are getting away from reality; and all these hindrances have been created by the mind in order not to see what is. Because to see what is, not only requires a great deal of capacity and awareness of action,

but it also means turning your back on everything that you have built up, your bank account, your name and everything that we call civilization. When you see what is you will find how loneliness is transformed.

Question: Are you not becoming our leader?

Krishnamurti: There are several ideas involved in this question; that I should enter politics; that I should help to lead India out of this present chaos and so on. Let us examine this question and see what it means. First of all, why do you want a leader? The question is not whether I am a leader and you are a follower. Why does one become a leader and why does one wish to be a follower, whether the leader be a man or a guru? We want a leader because we are uncertain. We do not know what to think; we are confused and because in our confusion we do not know what to do, we want somebody to protect us. Politically it becomes the tyranny of a dictator. That is what is happening and what is going to happen. When there is confusion, and psychologically we are confused, we want somebody to lead us. In the world there is confusion, misery, chaos, exploitation by the rich, by the capitalist, by the clever, by the intelligent, by those who have got a system and these become leaders, create a party and because we do not want anarchy we let them lead us. We do not want to be confused, we want somebody to tell us what to do. And so, we create leaders. Why do we create them?

Why do we hanker after leaders; why are we looking for leaders? Is it not because we want to be secure? We do not want to be uncertain about anything. Now, what happens? You not only create a leader but you become the follower. That is, you destroy yourself by following another. When you follow a tradition blindly, or follow a leader or a party, when you discipline yourself, are you not destroying your own thinking process? Instead there is confusion but nobody is going to bring order except yourself. Here is a marvellous state of confusion and you do not want to look at it. We want somebody to take us away from it. Then, what happens? What do the leaders do? They get up and talk and they become leaders. But what they promise they must fulfill in action and when they cannot they feel frustrated.

So, exploitation exists not only between the worker and

the owner, but also between the follower and the leader, because if the leader does not lead he feels lost. If the leader does not get up and talk on the platform what is he? You not only create the leader but because of his own frustration and confusion you are also exploiting him. Exploitation is mutual. Haven't you noticed this? As the leader depends upon you and you depend upon the leader where are we going to be led to?

This desire to create a leader is a form of self-fulfillment. You fulfill yourself in a leader and he fulfills himself in you, by seeking to save you, to guide you. But he is the leader you have created and therefore it is mutual exploitation, mutual self-fulfillment and therefore it is leading nowhere. Obviously it is exploitation, when it is only a self-fulfillment through an organization. If there is self-fulfillment then it must lead to frustration and as we do not want to be frustrated we are always trying to watch for the inevitable. And therefore the leader becomes very important. He has to be the leader and you have to be the follower.

Now, I do not want to fulfill myself in that way. I do not believe in self-fulfillment, it leads to misery. It leads to chaos and as I do not depend on you financially or for my psychological demands, I am not your leader. It does not matter to me whether there is one or many or none to listen to me. I do not believe in mutual exploitation, it leads to such absurd indignities and intrigues and therefore I am not your leader and you are not going to make me your leader. That is very simple, because there must be the two, those who want to lead and those who want to be led. As I do not want to lead, nor to follow anybody I am out of that class. Because true reality is not found through following anybody, it is not self-fulfillment. It comes into being only when the self is absent, when there is freedom from psychological demands, when the mind is free to act in pursuing anything. The pursuit is indicative of creation and when all desires cease then there is reality.

Question: What is the difference between belief and confidence? Why do you condemn belief?

Krishnamurti: First of all let us see what is belief and what is confidence. What do we mean by belief? Why

do we have to believe? Is it not because we have a desire to be certain, to be secure? Psychologically it is disturbing not to have a belief, is it not? If you have no belief in God, in a political party, you will be very disturbed. Would you not? Fear, belief in reincarnation, in dozens of things. So, belief is a demand to be secure made by the mind and therefore what happens? The mind seeking security, seeking belief, creates belief. Either it creates it for itself or it takes the beliefs of others and whether it has created it or has taken it over from others, the mind holds on to it, and says 'I believe'. Or it projects the belief into the future and makes out of it a certainty, a security according to which it disciplines itself. As various factors are bound to lead to different beliefs, you believe in God and another believes there is no God. You are a Muslim and another is a Hindu or a Christian and then what happens? Belief divides. Does it not? The desire to be secure psychologically is bound to create division because you are creating, giving importance to various things that are secondary.

See what belief is doing in the world. Politically or religiously there are innumerable schemes which you believe to be the solvent of our difficulties. There are religious beliefs of such extraordinary varieties, and each individual pursues his own belief because it brings him comfort, and becomes a means of propaganda and exploitation. Belief inevitably separates. If you have a belief or when you seek security in your particular belief you become separated from those who are seeking security in other forms of belief. Therefore, all organized beliefs are based on separatism, though they may preach brotherhood. That is exactly what is happening in the world because belief is a hidden psychological demand for self-fulfillment. That is, by fulfilling yourself by means of a belief, you think you will be happy. Therefore, belief becomes an extraordinarily important factor in religion, in politics, etc.

If you feel you are a human being, do you think you would be fighting like this? You are a Hindu and you are fighting with a Musalman and you are killing each other; the English fought the Germans and so on. So belief is formed because of a desire for self-fulfillment, for security; and because we demand security and strive for it, we have an end and the end is a projection of ourselves. If the end were unknown we would not believe. It is a projection of the self and there-

fore it creates separatism and it becomes a barrier between you and another and that is exactly what is happening. I am not inventing a theory, but I am describing a fact, psychologically as well as organizationally a fact. We all believe in a pattern because we feel it to be very safe, the leader as well as the follower. If you analyse belief very carefully and look into it you will find that it is a form of self-fulfillment, of mutual exploitation, and that it does not lead to any answer. That is what belief has done for us.

And what do we mean by confidence? Most of us confide in someone or feel confidence in something. If you have practised something, read books, etc., it gives you a certain confidence, because you have practised, done it over and over again with confidence. It is a form of aggressiveness. You can do something and therefore you feel delighted with yourself—"I can do something and you cannot." Confidence in a name, in a capacity—such confidence is aggression. Is it not? Such confidence is also self-exploitation which again is akin to belief. Therefore belief and confidence are similar. They are the two sides of the same coin.

Now, there is another kind of confidence which comes through self-knowledge. It should not really be called confidence, but for the lack of a better word we will call it 'confidence'. When there is awareness, when the mind is aware of what it is thinking, feeling, doing, not only in the superficial layer of consciousness but in the deeper hidden layers, when we are fully aware of all the implications, then there comes a sense of freedom, a sense of assurance, because you know. When you know a cobra you are free from it, aren't you? When you know something is poisonous there is an assurance, there is a freedom that was unknown hitherto. There is an assurance, an extraordinary joy, a creative hope, a sense of aliveness when the self has been explored, none of which is based on belief. When the self has been explored and all its tricks and corners are known to the mind, then the mind is assured of its creator. Therefore it ceases to create and in that cessation there is creation.

Sirs, please do not be hypnotized. You may be, as I said in the beginning of the talk, in that receptive mood when the seed is set in place, takes root. I hope sincerely that the seed has been planted because it is not words, it is not listening

to me which will free you. What is going to free you, to deliver each one of us from sin and suffering is that realization, that awareness of what is. To know what it is exactly: not to translate it, not to explain it away, not to condemn; to know exactly what it is and to perceive it without obstruction brings freedom. That is freedom and through that freedom alone can truth be known.

November 9, 1947

V

It would be very interesting if we could take the journey together into self-exploration but unfortunately the difficulty with most of us is that we are used to watching rather than partaking; we would watch the game and be the spectators rather than the actual players. I think it would be beneficial if we could all play the game and be creative, and not only watch one person think, feel, live. The difficulty with most of us is that we have forgotten how to play in the sense of partaking, sharing and discovering for ourselves. We are accustomed to being told what to do, what to think and what the right action is. We are so unaccustomed to discover for ourselves the process of our own thinking from which alone action takes place. So, if we can, let us not be mere spectators but let us actually partake in what is being discussed; which means we must establish a fully communicable relationship between ourselves, between you and me. Most of us have relationship verbally and the difficulty is to go beyond that verbal level to a deeper level so that we can understand the identical thing instantly; because, after all, communication has purpose only when both understand. You may understand but if I do not, then communication between us ceases and the difficulty always is to establish the right kind of communication on the identical level and at the same time, so that there can be instantaneous comprehension. So, it would be worthwhile I think, if we could take the journey together and not for you merely to watch me take the journey and tell you or

describe to you the results of my journey. That would be utterly futile.

What we have been discussing the last few Sundays can be stated in a very few words, I think; and the simpler the statement, the more clear it will be. But unfortunately if it is oversimplified, the problem itself becomes non-existent. Yet the problem is there. Our problem is about the search for happiness and the overcoming of sorrow. We want happiness and yet our constant companion is sorrow. Now let us take the journey together and find out what we think of the problem, as though it were new and not as though I was merely describing what has been taking place in you and you were merely listening to me and communicating my meaning to yourselves. Let us be aware together, at the same time, on the same level, so that we can really go into it deeper and deeper at every discussion and every talk.

We seek happiness, do we not, through things, through relationship, through ideas or thought? So, things, relationship and ideas, and not happiness, become all important. That is, whenever we seek happiness through something, the thing becomes important and not happiness. When stated like that it sounds very simple, and it is very simple. Because we seek happiness in property, in family, in ideas, the property, family and ideas become all important; we expect to find happiness through something. Now, can happiness be found through anything? Things made by the hand or by the mind have assumed greater significance than happiness itself, and because, things, relationship and ideas are so obviously impermanent, we are always unhappy. That is, we seek happiness through things and we find that there is no happiness. If we examine a little bit more closely we will find that happiness does not come through things. Then again, if we shift to another level, the level of relationship between ourselves and others, whether it be the society, the family or the nation, we see the enormous difficulty of adjustment between ourselves and others. So, if you observe it very closely you will find that there is an extraordinary impermanency in relationship, though we try to anchor ourselves in relationship and make it a refuge and a security. Similarly with ideas. One system of ideas can be broken down by another system of ideas and so on. Yet we

do not seem to realize the impermanency of all things—using the word not in its metaphysical but in its purely ordinary sense. Things are impermanent; they wear out. In the case of relationships, there is constant friction. The same is true for ideas and beliefs which have no stability. Yet we seek our happiness in them because we do not realize the impermanency of things, of ideas and relationships. And so after trying one set of relationships, one set of things, we move to another, from one page to another, hoping to find happiness and we never find it. So, sorrow becomes our constant companion and the overcoming of sorrow our chief problem.

How can we overcome it? We have never asked ourselves whether happiness can be found through something, through knowledge, through contact or through God. Can happiness be achieved through an object, either an ideological object or a physical object? Sorrow is inevitable as long as we seek happiness through something. Is it not a fact that we seek happiness through something and when we do not find it in this world we move to the next world; when we do not find it in the family, in virtue, in ideas, we try to find it through a permanent entity called God? So it is always through something, through an object.

So the problem is—can happiness, which is never found through anything, be found at all? If I cannot find it through something, can it exist or am I only happy when I am not seeking, when I do not want happiness through anything? Can happiness exist by itself? To find that out we have to explore the river of self-knowledge. But, self-knowledge is not an end in itself. It is like following a stream to its source. Is there a source to a stream? Surely not. Every drop from the beginning to the end makes the river, and to imagine that we will find happiness at the source is an error. Happiness cannot be found through anything but only by following the river of self-knowledge, that is oneself.

So our difficulty lies in that we have to follow not only our conscious but also our unconscious motives, demands and purposes. Those of us who have listened somewhat earnestly, must have made the experiment of following thoughts and feelings consciously. That is by becoming aware of conscious thoughts and feelings and ideas, we clear the mind of all conflict and all tribulations and confusions and begin to receive the

unconscious thoughts and intimations. So in order to begin following the stream of self-knowledge there must be a clarification of the conscious, that is one must be aware of what is consciously taking place. That is, by becoming aware of the conscious activities, which I assure you is quite difficult, the unconscious thoughts and hidden intentions and motives can be understood. So, as the conscious is the present, the now, through the present the unconscious and hidden thoughts can be understood; and the unconscious and hidden thoughts cannot be understood through any other means except by becoming intensely aware of the present and by freeing ourselves from those complications, uncompleted actions and thoughts that are constantly creeping into the conscious mind.

So, all of us who really want to experiment, who really want to undertake the journey must free the thoughts in our conscious mind. That is, to make it simpler, the conscious mind is surely occupied with the immediate problems, the job, the family, studies, politics, the Brahmin and the non-Brahmin and so on. So, without our understanding those problems of the conscious mind and doing away with them, how can we proceed further? And to sweep that clear, is this not our constant problem of living? With these problems we are occupied, the state, nationalism, class division, property, relationship and ideas that constantly float into the conscious mind. How are we to solve the problem of property and class division—property that creates so much hatred and enmity and class divisions, and brings such conflict and despair? With that, our conscious mind is actually occupied. And if we do not clear that up, surely we cannot go very far and follow up the stream of self-knowledge.

So what we want first is that extraordinary beginning of taking a step. So those who want to make the journey across to the other shore, to see and discover where self-knowledge leads them must surely be aware consciously of what they are thinking, feeling and their habits, their traditions and their verbal expressions, the manner of their speech to their wives, to their servants, and to their immediate superiors. That will reveal how the mind is working and from there you can proceed and as you proceed you discover; and discovery of the real is happiness and it is not through some-

nicians will function efficiently and therefore automatically. This is what is happening in the world, whether the government is of the left or of the right. They do not want you to think but if you do think, then you must think along a particular line or according to what religious organizations say. We have been through this process, the control by the organized religion, by the priests and by the government. It has resulted in disaster and in the exploitation of man. Whether man is exploited in the name of God or in the name of the government, it is the same thing. As man is human he eventually breaks up the system. So that is one of the problems; as long as education is the hand-maiden of the government there is no hope. This is the tendency we find everywhere in the world at the present time whether it is inspired by the right or by the left, because if you are left free to think for yourself you may revolt and therefore you will have to be liquidated. There are various methods of liquidation which we need not go into.

Sirs, in considering education we will have to find out the purpose of education, the purpose of living. If that is not clear to you why educate yourself? What is significant? What are we living for? What are we struggling for? If that is not clear to you education has no significance. Has it? One period will be technical, another period will be religious, the next period will be something else again and so on. We are talking about a system and so is it not important to find out what it is all about? Are you merely being educated in order to get a job? Then you make living a means to a job and you make of yourself a man to fit into a groove. Is that the purpose? We must think of this problem in that light and not merely repeat slogans. To a life that is not free from systems whether they be modern or ancient, free of even the most advanced and progressive ideas, education will have no meaning. If you do not know why you are living, what is the purpose of being educated, then why make so much fuss about how you are educated? As it is, you are being led to the cannon. You are becoming cannon-fodder. If that is what we want then certainly we must make ourselves extremely efficient to kill each other and that is what is happening. Is it not? There are more armies, more armaments, more money invested in producing bacteriological war-

nency. They want 'status quo', things as they are, with wars and competition and a political world in which everybody is confused, pulling at each other, destroying each other.

You ask me what I should do about education. It is too vast a subject. If you want things to be continued as they are, then you must accept the present system which brings constant wars and confusion, never a moment of peace in the world. And it is much more difficult to educate the educator than the child because the educator has already grown stupid. I do not think you realize what is happening in the world. how catastrophic it all is. The educator is becoming dull and he does not know what to do. He is confused. He goes from one system to another, from one teacher to another, from the oldest to the most ancient and yet he does not find what he is looking for, for the very simple reason that he has not located the source of confusion which is himself. How can such a man awaken intelligence in another? So, that is one of the problems.

What is the child? He is a product of yourself, is he not? So he is already conditioned, is he not? He is the result of the past and the present. The idea that if given freedom, the child would develop naturally seems to be fallacious because after all the child is the father and the father is the child though with certain modifications of tendencies. To give freedom to a child you must first understand yourself, the giver of freedom, the educator. If I have to educate a child but do not understand myself and so start with my conditioned response, how can I teach him? How can I awaken intelligence in him? So that is part of the problem. Then there is the question of nourishment, care and love. Most of us have no real love for our children though we talk about it. Sirs, education is something tremendous and without love I do not possibly see how there can be education. The moment you love somebody you understand the person, your heart is in it. Do we love our children? Do we love our wives or husbands? Do we love our neighbours? We do not, because if we did there would be a different world. There is no true education through a system. If we love there must be instantaneous communication, on the same level and at the same time and because we ourselves are dry, empty. governments and systems have taken over. The educator

becomes important, the environment becomes significant because we do not know how to love.

I am afraid you will say that I have said nothing positive about education. Is not negative thinking the highest form of thinking, for wisdom comes through negation? Do not put what I say into your old bottles and thus lose the perfume. Sirs, surely to transform the world there must be regeneration within ourselves. We find we have blue-prints to educate our children but naturally blue-prints have no love. Therefore you produce machines. We have brains but what has happened to them. We are becoming cannon-fodder. We are not creators. We are not thinkers. We do not know how to love, we are merely drudging with our routine minds and naturally we become inefficient and the government which wants efficiency for destruction is going to make us efficient. There is an efficiency inspired by love which is greater than the efficiency of machinery.

Question: The traditional method of reaching Adepts or Masters by training given by them or through their disciples is still said to be open to humanity. Are your teachings intended for those who are on that path?

Krishnamurti: Sirs, let us really go into this question of various paths leading to ultimate reality. A path can only lead to that which is known and that which is the known is not the truth. When you know something it ceases to be truth because it is past, it is entirely arrested. Therefore the known, the past is caught in the net of time and therefore it is not the truth, it is not the real. So, a path leading to the known cannot lead you to truth and a path can only lead to the known and not to the unknown. You take a path to a village, to a house, because you know where the house is in the village and there are many paths to your house, to your village. But reality is the unmeasurable, the unknown. If you could measure it it would not be truth. Because what you have learned through books, through the say-so of others, is not real; it is only repetition and what is repeated is not truth any longer.

So, is there any path to truth? We have thought so far that all paths lead to truth. Do they? Does the path of the ignorant, the path of the man with ill-will lead to truth? He

must abandon all paths. Must he not? A man who is concerned with murdering people in the name of the state, can he find truth unless he abandons his occupation? So all paths do not lead to truth. A man who is addicted to the acquiring of knowledge cannot find truth because he is concerned with knowledge and not with truth. The man who accepts devotion, will he find truth? Obviously not, because he has chosen a particular path and not the whole. Will the man of action find reality? Obviously not, for the simple reason that by following a part we cannot find the whole. That means knowledge, devotion and action separately cannot lead anywhere but to destruction, to illusion, to restlessness. That is what has happened. The man who has pursued knowledge for the sake of knowledge, believing that it would lead him to reality, becomes a scientist, yet what has marvellous science done to the world? I am not decrying science. The scientist is like you and me; only in his laboratory he differs from us. He is like you and me with his narrowness, with his fears and nationalism.

So a man who really seeks reality must have devotion, knowledge and action. They are not three separate paths leading to some extraordinary thing called reality. Yet, devotion to something is only another fantastic phase. Remove the object of his devotion, and the man is lost and he will fight and he will do everything to hold on to it. Therefore it is no longer devotion. It is merely an emotional outlet, centered upon something which he calls devotion; but a man who is really devoted, is devoted to the search itself and not to knowledge.

To believe that there is a path to the Masters, to the Adepts or a path reached through their disciples is also rather fantastic. Is it not? Because wisdom is not found through a disciple or through a Master. Happiness is not found through any means other than by abandoning the idea that we are the chosen few who travel along a special path. This idea merely gives us a sense of security, a sense of aggrandizement. The idea that yours is the direct path and that ours will take more time is the outcome of immature thinking. Does it not divide mankind into systematized paths? It is those that are mature who will find the truth. He who is mature never pursues, whether it be the path of the Adepts

or the path of knowledge, of science, of devotion or of action. A man who is committed to any particular path is immature and such a man will never find the eternal, the timeless, because the part, the particular to which he is committed belongs to time. Through time you can never find the timeless. Through misery you can never find happiness. Misery must be set aside if happiness is to be. If you love, in that love there can be no contention and no conflict. In the midst of darkness there is no light and when you get rid of darkness, you have light. Similarly, love is when there is no possessiveness, when there is no condemnation, when there is no self-fulfillment. Those of us who are committed to paths have vested interests, mental, emotional and physical and that is why we find it extremely difficult to become mature; how can we abandon that to which we have clung for the past fifty or sixty years? How can you leave your house and become once more a beggar just as you were when you were really seeking? Now you have committed yourself to an organization of which you are the head, the secretary or a member. To the man who is seeking, the search itself is love, that itself is devotion, that itself is knowledge. The man who has committed himself to a particular path or action is caught up in systems and he will not find truth. Through the part the whole is never found. Through a little crack of the window we do not see the sky, the marvellous clear sky and the man who can see the sky clearly is the man who is in the open, away from all paths, from all traditions and in him there is hope and he will be the saviour of mankind

Question *What profession would you advise me to take?*

Krishnamurti: Each question is related to some other question. Each thought is related to another and is not separate. The profession, the path, education, self-knowledge are all intimately interrelated. You cannot merely choose a profession and pursue self-knowledge or choose a profession to be an educator. They are all interrelated. All actions, all feelings are interrelated and that is the beauty of it. If you take one thought you can go into the whole depth of thinking.

You ask: what profession would you advise me to take?

If you want a right answer we must go into it fully. What is happening in this world? Is there any choice of profession? You take what you can jolly well get. You are lucky if you can get work. This is so in all parts of the world. Because we have lost all true values we have but one aim: to get money somehow to live. Since that value is predominating in the world there is no choice. If you are a B.A., B.Sc., or an M.A., you become a clerk. The structure of society is such that it leads to destruction. The society is geared to destroy. Every action that you do is leading to war.

I do not know if you are aware of it, but in the midst of this storm, and starvation, can you choose to become a lawyer, a soldier, or a policeman? When you really feel that mankind is on the brink of a catastrophe can you choose any of these three professions? By becoming a soldier can you solve the world's problem? A soldier functions to destroy and he will destroy. He is trained to destroy like the policeman whose office is to watch, to report, to spy, to intrigue; and you know what it is to be a lawyer—a cunning man without much substance behind him. You are all lawyers and you know what you have done to the world by your cleverness and yet you are still turning out thousands of lawyers. What is their profession? To divide and to keep up division and on that they live. They do not live on human relationship, and kindness and love but on cunning stupidity and intrigue. Can you join a man who makes money in the midst of this economic chaos? Can you know what starvation means?

So you see how limited the professions are. Sirs, before you can ask the question, what you are to do, you must know how to think rightly, not in a sloppy manner. Right thinking brings about right profession and right action. You cannot know how to think rightly without self-knowledge. Are you willing to spend the time to know yourself, so that you can think rightly and find the right profession? Those of you who are not compelled to choose immediately a profession, surely you can do something. Therefore, those of you who have leisure have the responsibility, those who have time to know and to observe. But those who can, do not. It is immensely difficult to choose a job in a civilized world of this kind where every action leads to destruction and exploitation. Many who are not pressed to choose a profession are those who can, but

they do not, and that is the tragedy. You do not, because you are afraid. When the house is already on fire you still want to hold on to a few things. So the tragedy is not for those who have to choose a profession, they are going to choose it willy-nilly, but it is for those who sit back and observe. Through right thinking alone can there be right action. Right thinking is not achieved through books, through past memories or through future hopes.

November 16, 1947

VI

I think we ought to spend some time considering what is right listening. I think there is an art to listening. Most of us are accustomed to translate what is being said into our own terms, interpret it according to our own understanding, our background, our tradition. Is it not possible to listen as though we had no background at all, merely listen as we would listen to a song or music? You are not interpreting music when you are listening. You are *listening to the silence* in between two notes; you are attentive and sufficiently relaxed, sufficiently focussed to give your whole attention without any effort, because you feel a tremendous interest. Likewise when there is right communication—right communication exists only when there is affection, love—there is immediate response. There is no translation, there is no interpretation, there is comprehension at the same time, on the same level, but it is very rare to find people who love each other so completely that there is complete understanding. Most people meet, but on different levels and at different times, whereas what we are trying to do is not only to listen, but also at the same time to be creative, which is not merely following or accepting or denying verbally, but to experiment within yourself with what is being said as though you were following your own thoughts sufficiently alertly and yet silently. But the difficulty is that we do not know how to listen, how to see, and how to hear because when a thing that is said is new, we put it into old bottles, fit it into old terminologies and therefore we spoil it,

like 'new wine put into old bottles'. What happens when you put new wine into old bottles? Fermentation starts and the bottles break and yet, I am afraid that is what most of us are doing. We do not approach our experience anew. We approach it anew only when there is a tremendous interest, when there is great love. It is something new every second and not a continuation of the old or an interpretation according to a pattern or a system of thought.

So, if I may suggest, it would be worthwhile if we could listen with that peculiar quality of creative attention, as though we were meeting something anew. As I said over and over again, a truth that is repeated ceases to be a truth and by merely hearing it, it becomes a repetition, which you translate into your own terms, which you fit into particular channels with which you are familiar and so it ceases to be the truth. Whereas if you listen with that intense creative understanding, creative stillness, which is not interpretation, then it is your truth and that is what liberates you and gives you freedom, gives you happiness. We miss that happiness, that creative joy, if we merely translate or absorb the old books, or hear the words of some teacher or saint. So, there can be happiness only when the mind is capable of receiving the new; but as our mind is the result of the old, it is extremely difficult to listen as though we have never heard it before. I do not know if you have listened to the songs of the birds in the morning. You must have. You never compare it to yesterday's song. It is new, it is something very lovely because your mind is fresh, untroubled by the day's activities and so is capable of hearing it as if for the first time even though the song is as old as the hills. Similarly, please listen to whatever I am saying as though you were hearing it anew, and you will see an extraordinary thing taking place in yourself, because happiness is not something that is old, but happiness is something that is constantly renewing itself.

As I said last week, what is sought through an object, whether material or psychological, can never yield happiness. In that case what seems happiness is merely gratification, which is always impermanent. So to understand happiness or to be happy, we must understand the process of becoming happy and that is what we are all trying to do. We are trying to become happy. We are trying to become virtuous. We

are trying to become cleverer than we are. So if we can understand the becoming and the being, then perhaps we shall understand what happiness is.

Surely becoming and being are two wholly different states. Becoming is continuous and have you noticed that that which is continuous is always binding? Relationship is binding if it is merely continuous, if it is merely a habit. If it is merely a gratification, it is merely a habit. The moment it ceases to be continuous, there is a new quality in relationship and if you go into it further you will see that where there is continuity, habit, a thought-process which is moving from continuity to continuity, there is always a bond of friction, of pain; yet if we do not understand this continuity, which is the becoming, there is no being. You never say to yourself, 'I will become happy'. So, being can only be understood, when becoming ceases.

To put it differently, after all, virtue gives freedom. Have you ever noticed that an immoral man is stupid, because he is caught, he is miserable; while the really virtuous are free and happy and are not becoming something but being. That is, there can be freedom only in virtue, because it is orderly, clear and free; but a man who is not virtuous is disorderly and unclear and his mind is confused. So virtue is not an end in itself, but it creates that freedom without which reality cannot exist; but when we translate virtue as a means of becoming, then there is friction. So becoming and being virtuous are two wholly different states. Virtue is understanding, is it not? That which you understand brings freedom. That which you do not understand creates confusion, darkness and so on. The moment you understand something there is virtue. So, is understanding to come through effort, or is there a state in which effort has ceased for understanding to be? Does understanding come through effort, or does understanding come when there is no effort? Have you tested it or tried it? If I want to understand what you are saying, must I make an effort to listen? When I make an effort there are distractions. Then, distractions become more important than listening. Not being interested in what you are saying, I have to make an effort not to be distracted, in order to listen. Whereas if there is interest, if there is communion, then there is no effort. Now, you are listening to me

without effort. The moment you make an effort, you have ceased to understand.

After all when you see a picture or a painting, do you make an effort? If you want to criticize, to compare, or to find out who painted it, then you have to make an effort. If you really want to understand, you sit quietly in front of it, if the picture appeals to you. In that quietness in which there is no distraction, you understand the beauty of the picture.

So, surely virtue comes without any effort. But since our whole existence is based on effort, we must find out why we are making an effort, why this constant trouble, why this incessant battle to be something. To be something is what we are striving all day long, consciously or unconsciously. We strive to become something. I wonder if you have ever asked yourself why we are striving. Is striving inevitable? Is striving part of existence and what do we mean by making an effort? Essentially it is to be something other than what we are. Is it not so? You see what is and you do not like it and you want to be something else. The essential reason behind all effort is the desire to transform what is into something which is to be. I am stupid and I am striving to become clever. Can stupidity ever become cleverness or must stupidity merely cease? If we can understand that, we shall understand the whole significance of making an effort. That is, we are afraid to face what is. We are afraid to understand what is and therefore we always strive to transform, to move, to change. Surely a rose is not striving. It is what it is. In the very being there is a kind of creation. It does not desire to be other than what is. It knows no strife other than the natural strife to live. With us, there is not only the natural struggle to survive—that is, for food, clothing and shelter—but there is the struggle to transform that which is. Yet we do not understand that which is.

So the difficulty is to understand what is and a mind cannot understand what is, if it is distracted, if it is seeking something other than what is, if it is trying to transform what is into something else. Is not our whole education based on that? Are not our religious conceptions and formulae rooted in that? You are this and you must become that. You are greedy and you must become non-greedy, and

therefore strive, strain and struggle to become that. But, if you understood what is, there is no striving. If you are greedy and if you really understood what greed is, then there is no becoming non-greedy. But to understand what greed is you have to give your whole attention, you have to be significantly aware of its extensional values. We won't understand as long as we are striving to change what is into something which is more desirable.

Take a very simple example. If one is stupid and one tries to become clever, can one become clever? You would say 'yes', yet can one become clever by passing examinations, by studying and acquiring knowledge and sharpening one's mind? Surely not. That person is still stupid. Greed can never become non-greed. Only when greed, stupidity, etc., cease, is there virtue, intelligence, a state in which there is no greed, no stupidity. Only when I know that I am stupid, will I begin to have intelligence. But, merely to strive after cleverness is not intelligence. Do you need to make an effort in order to understand what is? You make an effort only when you are distracted. Our whole tendency, educationally, spiritually, socially is based on transforming what is into something other than what is. We have spent our days and our energies in transforming what is without understanding what is. Is it not extraordinary, if we look at it in that way? How can you transform anything without understanding what is? To understand what is, surely you must not suppress it, you must not control it, but merely look at it without condemnation or justification. Surely, suppression or discipline do not bring understanding. They only distract from what is. Whereas, if we spent all that energy which we now waste by striving to change what is, in understanding what is, we would find an extraordinary transformation, which is not the result of effort, but the result of understanding. Understanding comes only when there is no effort, when there is a stillness, and when there is no striving to be other than what is.

Question: What is the difference between introspection and awareness?

Krishnamurti: Introspection begins when there is the desire to change the self. I introspect myself in order

/ to transform, modify, change myself into something. That is why we look into ourselves. I am unhappy and I look into myself to find the cause of unhappiness. To introspect is to, look into oneself, to change oneself, to modify oneself according to environmental and religious demands. What happens in that process? In that process there is condemnation. I do not like this and I must become that. I am greedy and I must change to be non-greedy. I am angry and I must become peaceful. By that strife you begin to modify. But the effort becomes tyrannic, does it not? This introspection leads nowhere. Have you tried to become introspective? Is there not a continuity in introspection and therefore a bondage? Every experience is translated according to the pattern of the self, which is always examining, translating, interpreting, putting away things which it does not like and accepting things which it wants. So, introspection is a constant struggle to change what is, whereas awareness is the recognition of what is and therefore the understanding of what is. You cannot recognize or understand something when you condemn it. You can understand only when you are observant, when you are not dissecting or pulling apart to see what is. It is only when you are quiet that what is begins to unfold.

Let us take an example and I hope I can make it clearer. When the man of introspection is aware that he is greedy, what is his reaction? It is one of condemnation, is it not? Or it may be a denial or a justification. He wants to change it, that is, to change the quality of greed which is painful or pleasant. He either identifies himself with it and therefore pursues it or he denies it and puts it aside. Therefore the reaction is always one of justification, condemnation or identification because he is always translating what is in terms of becoming. This is what we are doing in our daily life. and we are spending our life in this constant transformation of what is, that is, we are striving to be free from greed and still we are greedy, we are confused and weary. After all, the action of a man of introspection is residual, his action springs always from the residue of yesterday, whereas for the man of awareness there is no residual response. He is simply aware, which means, he is not translating, not condemning, not justifying and not identifying himself with anything and therefore his response is non-residual, it is spon-

taneous. So, there is a great deal of difference between residual response and awareness, the one is a becoming and therefore a constant strife, and the other is being aware of what is and therefore understanding what is and going above and beyond what is, which the introspector can never do.

So, if you really go into it very deeply you will see the extraordinary creative quality of being aware and the destructive quality of introspection. The man of introspection, the introvert—which is unfortunately a psycho-analytical phrase—is a man who is concerned with changing what is and he can never be creative. He is only concerned with improving himself and he can never be free. He is only moving within the fortress of his own desires and therefore he can never find reality. He is never happy. Reality will shun him because he is immersed in the idea of becoming righteous. You know that a respectable man, a righteous man, is a curse, which does not mean that the sinner is not also a curse. But at least the sinner is aware and is inquiring and therefore there is a possibility that he will see more than the man who is respectable in his enclosure. Whereas a man of awareness understands directly what is, and in that understanding of what is, there is an extraordinary transformation, an instantaneous transformation, which is creation.

Question. Do you believe in immortality?

Krishnamurti: What do you mean by a belief? Why do you believe and what is there to believe? Do you believe that you are alive? Do you believe that you hear? Does not belief come to be when you are confused, disturbed, anxious and because you need to believe in something to give you a sense of tranquillity? Belief then is not what is, and a man who is aware of what is, will never believe. What is there to believe? Surely, when a man believes, his belief is based on some authority which gives him security, certainty, such as the society which provides him with a job, or the organization which gives him a house. For that same reason a man believes in the Master or in his brother because it places him in a safe position. So, belief ensures security and a man who is secure can never find reality, and can never find what is eternal. Only the man who is inquiring, uncertain, anxiously searching, neither accepting nor denying,

will find reality. But a man who is resting in his security can never find reality and because belief makes a man secure, it not only binds him but destroys his creative thinking.

What do we mean by immortality? We will perhaps understand it if we can understand what is continuity. If we can understand death perhaps we shall be able to understand immortality. If we can understand the ending of things, then we shall be able to understand that which is imperishable, immortal. And therefore to understand the immortal, the imperishable, we have to understand the ending which we call death. We say we understand death because we see a dead body. Surely that is not death. Death is the unknown, is it not? As reality, the imperishable, is the unknown, so death is the unknown and you do not know it. But you have searched for years, for centuries and given all your thoughts to truth which is also the unknown but you have avoided thinking about death. Why is that? I think, there is the problem, if we can understand it. Death, the unknown, you have shunned and put away, and you have pursued reality, you have pursued and you have written volumes about God; every temple has an image of Him or inscriptions about Him. By your thoughts you have given life to things. Why have we pursued reality, God, the Truth, the unknown? You do not know it. If you knew it the world would be different and we would love one another. Why do you shun one and accept the other? You shun death because you fear the cessation of continuity and pursue immortality because you want continuity. So you invest in God, not knowing what you are investing in. Is this not very odd? And after investing in God you ask, is there immortality, because you want insurance, a further guarantee and the man who assures you of immortality, will gratify you and you will be pleased.

Surely the problem is not whether there is immortality or whether there is not. If I tell you there is, what difference will it make? Will you transform your life tomorrow? Certainly not. If I tell you there is not, you will go to some one else who will assure you there is. So you are between the believer and the non-believer and it gives you pain. And to understand anxiety or fear of death, you must find out why there is this division between reality and death; why you pursue ceaselessly, generation after generation what you

call God not knowing what it is and always avoiding the thought of death. Has there been a sacred book about death? No. There have always been books and books on God.

If you know God as an idea or as a formula it cannot be real. Surely the unknown can never be translated into things. The real cannot be explained to him who does not know it. There is immediate communication between two persons who love each other. You can write poems about love, volumes and volumes about it, but you cannot communicate it to another if he does not know it. Similarly, it seems to me futile to inquire whether there is God, because if you search rightly you will find out if there is or if there is not. Similarly if you search rightly you will find out the significance of death. We seek continuity through property, through family, or through beliefs or ideation and as long as we are assured of continuity there is no fear. So the man who is seeking psychological continuity invests in property and when he realizes its impermanency, he seeks other forms of continuity, psychological continuity in the nation, in the race and if that is denied to him, then in belief of the ultimate continuity in God, the unknown, and when that assurance is threatened he calls it death of which he is afraid. So, we are not really concerned with reality or God or death, we are concerned with continuity which we call by a lovely word 'immortality'. You only want continuity in some form or another, to be given to you by a name, by the family, by the priest, by the book, by tradition, by the temple.

What happens to anything that continues? It decays, or it becomes a routine and therefore merely functions as a machine. Continuity is a guarantee of decay, but the moment you think you will cease to continue you become afraid. If you are aware of that fear you will see that the fear ceases. Only then will you be able to understand that there is no division between death and life because death and reality are the unknown; but a mind that is moving, that has its being in the known can never find the unknown. The known is always the continuous and the mind clings to the known and gives life to the known, and therefore it is always moving within the house of the known and it is that known which wants to be continued. Surely that which is known is already

in the net of time. It can never know the unknowable and it is only when the mind is freed from the net of time that there is the timeless. Then only there is a life that is not thought in terms of time or continuity. To understand death there must be no fear. But a man who desires continuity is frightened and the escapes that civilization has created to allay his fear have so drugged him, made him so dull, that he cannot see the significance of death. Surely death is as lovely as the real is, because both are the unknown, but a mind that is merely functioning within the known can never understand the unknown.

Question: Please explain further what you mean by the clarification of the conscious?

Krishnamurti: I said in my talk last Sunday that the superficial consciousness must clarify itself and be clear, for the hidden to project itself—the hidden motives, unconscious and subconscious hidden demands, pursuits, ignorance and darkness, the hidden being not the real. That is, if we would understand anything, the immediate mind must be calm. What generally happens when you have a problem is that you think about it, worry over it like a dog worries over a bone, you take it, tear it, look at it from different angles and at the end of the day you are tired of the problem and you go to bed, worn out by your struggle to comprehend and to find a solution. When you go to bed and when you sleep your conscious mind is relaxed because having thought a great deal you cannot think any more. Being relaxed, when you wake up in the morning you see the answer.

There is a phrase, 'go and sleep over a problem for the answer.' What happens is that your conscious mind, not understanding the problem, puts it aside and having detached itself from it, has become clarified; and the unconscious or the deeper layers begin to project themselves into the conscious and when you wake up, the problem has been very simply solved. So, similarly the conscious mind, the upper layers of consciousness must be clarified so that the mind can always be tranquil, so that it can receive intimations or hints from the hidden. But we are not tranquil. Our conscious mind is incessantly restless, moving from problem to problem, from one desire to another, from one demand to another, from one distraction to another and from one attraction to another. Have you not

noticed that the superficial layer is never still? It is always battling and striving, being very cunning in business, in law, cunning with God, with everything, it is so alive, so alert with knowledge and with education. So, how can such a mind be receptive? Surely, Sir, a room is useful only when it is empty and a conscious mind that is not empty is really a useless mind, it is no good for anything except modern civilization which is so utterly degraded and degenerated, because it is the product of the upper layer. The upper layer is mechanical, swift and cunning, ever safeguarding itself. Is not the modern civilization only mechanical and industrial, even though the upper layer may talk about beauty and the dance, and invest a great deal of money in education, in painting, in discussing the true dance, the unknown dance, the modern dance and so on? And if the upper layer of consciousness is not still, how can it be receptive, how can it receive intimations of things hidden, of things unknown?

So the problem then is how to make the upper layer of the mind, that superficial layer of consciousness, act. But is that not a wrong question to put to oneself? Because, to make the superficial consciousness act is only another form of activity. 'How' immediately becomes the problem and therefore you are back again where you were. What is important is to be aware of what is, aware that the superficial mind is restless, without denying or justifying it, aware of all its destructiveness and all its cleverness and its substitutions. And you will see that by *being*, not becoming, aware of it, the superficial consciousness becomes free to act.

When you are interested in something you listen to it. You are observing now the picture which I am painting and therefore the superficial layer is very quiet. If there is any distraction, your listening becomes merely a distraction. So the difficulty lies not in making the superficial consciousness which you call mind quiet but in being aware of all the extraordinary and rapid activities of the mind. To slow it down is very difficult and you can do it only if every thought is followed through fully, without fear and without condemnation. As long as the conscious mind, the superficial layer, is agitated, restless, demanding, seeking, striving and translating, it cannot understand and it is only in the clarity of the upper layers of consciousness that it can receive intimations of the hidden

nary silence, not induced, not enforced, that silence which is extraordinarily creative, that creative emptiness in which alone reality can enter. It cannot come to that which is *becoming*, which is striving, it can only come to that which is *being*, which understands what is. Then you will see that reality is not in the distance, the unknown is not far off, it is in what is. As the answer to a problem is in the problem, so reality is in what is, and if we can understand it then we shall know truth. But it is extremely difficult to be aware of dullness, to be aware of greed, to be aware of ill-will, ambition and so on. And the very fact of being aware of what is, is truth. It is truth that liberates, not your striving to be free. So, reality is not far, but we place it far away because we use it as a means to self-continuity. It is here, now, in the immediate. The eternal or the timeless is now and the now cannot be understood by a man who is caught in the net of time. To free thought from time demands action because the mind is lazy, it is slothful and therefore ever creates other hindrances. It is only possible by right meditation, which means complete action, not a continuous action; and complete action can only be understood when the mind understands the process of continuity, which is memory—not the factual, but the psychological memory—and as long as memory functions, the mind cannot understand what is. And one's mind, one's whole being, becomes extraordinarily creative, passively alert when we understand the significance of ending, because in ending there is renewal while in continuity there is death, there is decay.

November 23, 1947

VII

I have talked a little about right relationship between yourself and myself, but I would like to go further into that matter. It seems to me that the attitude as between a teacher and a pupil is a wrong attitude. We can well understand a pupil going to a technician to learn engineering or the art of painting, dancing or music. But is that our relationship

here? Are you actually learning anything from me? Or, are we trying together to unwrap something which is life, which is our every day existence, in which there is so much pain, so much strife and so much misery? Do we learn anything at all? Apart from technical subjects, do we learn anything, or does understanding come in spontaneously and freely? Is understanding the result of accumulation? You may have read a great many books, all the sacred literature, psychological, philosophical and other kinds of books. Do you gather understanding from books? Is not knowledge different from understanding and does the mere accumulation of knowledge yield understanding? So we ought to establish between ourselves the right relationship.

I talk about it at every meeting and at every discussion we have, because it seems very important to me to establish the right communication between ourselves. The moment you approach another with the attitude of getting something profitable out of him, either financially or spiritually, surely you will cut off all communication. Does the false respect that we show, indicate understanding? You show me respect sometimes but most of the time for your servants and wives and neighbours there is contempt, disrespect, indifference, or callousness. So what is important? To show respect to a man who you think has something to give you and to be contemptuous, hard and brutal to others? And does learning constitute the whole of existence? If it did, we would certainly misinterpret existence. But if we can understand from moment to moment the whole significance of existence, then perhaps there will be joy, there will be happiness. But if you are out merely to learn, to accumulate, through which accumulation you translate further experience, then life becomes a series of monotonous tragedies, despair, ugliness and darkness. Then you are concerned merely with accumulating, and acquiring a standard by which to live. Surely you do not call that living?

As it is, our existence is pretty awful and merely to understand verbally what is being said and use it as a pattern to translate everyday existence will not bring about understanding. Understanding comes when there is no effort, when there is a freshness. When you suddenly see something, is that because of accumulation of learning

or of acquisition? Surely not. It comes in freedom. So we ought to establish right relationship not only between ourselves but also in our daily existence. Then we will see how extraordinarily swift life is and also how painful it is, and how our existence leads us nowhere.

So, to understand the whole purpose of existence we must understand effort, because life or existence is sorrowful as we know it. There is nothing joyous. We are not happy people. Look at the strain, the turmoil that we go through. We are always in strife, we are always in struggle, there is never a moment's deep happiness when we can say 'we are happy'. Do we know such moments? We are in constant battle with ourselves and with our neighbours. We are hedged in and bound and our whole existence is a strife; and as it is a constant effort, a constant battle, what is it all meant for? And as we do not know happiness, except at rare intervals, we have completely forgotten it. We do have rare happy moments when our everyday strife, struggle and phenomena stop, but we do not know how to sustain it. It seems to me that until we know how, our life will have no meaning.

I think we will understand the significance of life if we understand what it means to make an effort. Does happiness come through effort? Have you ever tried to be happy? It is impossible, is it not? You struggle to be happy and there is no happiness. Is there? Joy does not come through suppression, through control or indulgence. You may indulge, but there is bitterness at the end. You may suppress or control but there is always strife in the hidden. So, happiness does not come through effort, nor joy through control and suppression and still all our life is a series of suppressions, a series of controls, a series of regretful indulgences. Also there is a constant overcoming, a constant struggle with our passions, our greed and our stupidity. So is not the strife, the struggle, the effort that we make, in the hope of finding happiness, finding something which will give us a feeling of peace, a sense of love? Yet, does love or understanding come by strife? So, I think it is very important to understand what we mean by struggle, strife or effort.

First we must be free to see that joy and happiness do not come through effort. Is creation through effort or is there

creation only with the cessation of effort? When do you write, paint or sing? When do you create? Surely when there is no effort, when you are completely open, when on all levels you are in complete communication, completely integrated. Then there is joy and then you begin to sing, or write a poem or paint or make a form. The moment of creation is not born of struggle.

So, we must very clearly understand this whole problem of struggle and strife. I know there are many, many ramifications, many different sides to it. But if we can understand the core of the problem of effort and its significance, then we can translate that into our daily life. But, if you merely approach the central issue through the part, I am afraid you will not understand the significance of effort. Does not effort mean a struggle to change 'what is' into what it is not, or into what it should be or should become? That is, we are constantly struggling to avoid facing 'what is', or we are trying to get away from it or to transform or modify 'what is'. A man who is truly content is the man who understands 'what is', gives the right significance to 'what is'. That is true contentment; it is not concerned with having few or many possessions, but with the understanding of the whole significance of 'what is'; and that can only come when you recognize what is, when you are aware of it, not when you are trying to modify it or change it.

So, effort is a strife or a struggle to transform that which is into something which you wish it to be. I am only talking about psychological struggle, not the struggle with a physical problem like engineering or some discovery or transformation which is purely technical. I am talking only of that struggle which is psychological and which always overcomes the technical. You may build with great care a marvellous society, using the infinite knowledge science has given us. But as long as the psychological strife and struggle and battle are not understood, and the psychological over-tones and currents are not overcome, the structure of society, however marvellously built, is bound to crash, as has happened over and over again.

So, effort is a distraction from 'what is'. Sirs, if I may suggest, think it over and you will see. The moment I accept 'what is' there is no struggle. Any form of struggle or strife

is an indication of distraction and distraction which is effort must exist as long as psychologically I wish to transform 'what is' into something it is not. Take for example 'anger'. Can anger be overcome by effort, by various methods and techniques, by meditations and various forms of transforming 'what is' into what is not? Now, suppose that instead of making an effort to transform anger into non-anger, you accepted or acknowledged that you are angry, what would happen then? You would be aware that you are angry. What would happen? Would you indulge in anger? Please follow what I am talking about and you will see. If you are aware that you are angry, which is 'what is', and knowing the stupidity of transforming 'what is' into what is not, would you still be angry? If instead of trying to overcome anger, modifying or changing it, you accepted it and looked at it, if you were completely aware of it, without condemning or justifying it, there would be an instantaneous change. But this is extremely difficult because our whole tendency is to transform or deny. We deny ugliness thinking that we shall achieve beauty.

Surely virtue is not the denial of vice; virtue is only the recognition of vice. The moment I know that I am angry and I do not try to transform my anger I cease to be angry. You try it, you experiment with yourself and you will see how extraordinary it is, how extraordinary is the creative quality of understanding 'what is'. Similarly there cannot be freedom if there is no virtue.

As I said last Sunday the stupid man is an unvirtuous man. He is disorderly. He creates havoc in society, not because he is unvirtuous but because he is stupid and to be virtuous requires the highest form of intelligence; to bring order within yourself requires an extraordinary capacity to see things as they are. When you recognize the false as false there is freedom. That is, freedom can only be approached negatively, not positively and to see the false is to see the true and there can only be freedom in virtue, in understanding, and not in becoming which is but the transforming of 'what is' into something else. This is the process of becoming: 'I will become this or that today or ten years from now'; 'I will become a pupil in my next life'; 'I will be virtuous the day after tomorrow'; and so on. Surely all

such ways of thinking are indicative of real stupidity, because they imply transforming 'what is' into something it is not. Surely you cannot make 'anger' into 'non-anger'. If you understand anger, that is, if you are aware of it fully, without condemnation, justification or identification, just aware that you are angry, that you are jealous, that you are greedy, that you are full of ill-will, then you will see an extraordinary thing taking place; your anger or jealousy drops away. It drops away spontaneously. It is only when we are not aware of exactly 'what is', that we make the effort to transform it.

So, effort is non-awareness. The moment you are aware, which is neither to condemn nor justify, the moment you accept, look and observe what is, there is no effort; then the thing that you observe, that which is, that which you are aware of, has an extraordinary significance. If you pursue that significance through, you complete that thought and therefore the mind is freed from it. So, awareness is non-effort, awareness is to perceive the thing as it is without distortion. Distortion exists whenever there is effort. When you love completely, every thought comes with such joy, clarity and happiness. This can only happen when there is integration and when there is no effort. Maturity or integration can only come when there is complete awareness of 'what is'.

Many questions have been sent to me. As I said before, you can ask innumerable questions, but you will not have the right answer if the questioner himself is not in earnest. As I leave, you give me your questions in writing or ask them verbally but I am afraid most of you are not aware of what you are asking. To find the right answer to a question we must study the problem, not merely wait for an answer. Life is not a series of conclusions, of 'yes' or 'no'. Life is a series of responses and challenges and it depends on you how you respond. To know how to respond requires immense study; immense self-knowledge gained not through tricks, not through gurus, but by yourself in your every day action and thought. My answers are only indications towards self-revelation. If you wait for a conclusion or an assertion from me you are going to be disappointed. But if together we study the problem, we will see and understand its many

what it means to be creative religiously and emotionally, to be creative at all moments, when you love, when you cry; when you are aware of that directly, surely then sex would become an insignificant problem.

But you see the difficulties. Passion or the biological urge is so strong, that religious societies through their tradition and laws have held you in restraint, but now that tradition and laws have little significance, you merely indulge in it.

Another enormous thing which we have lost through this struggle and through this regimentation, is love. Sex, love is chaste and without love merely to overcome or indulge in sex has no meaning. Without love, we have become what we are today, mere machines. If we look at our faces in the mirror we can see how unformed they are, how immature we are. We have produced children without love. Often we are emotionally driven without love and what kind of civilization do you expect to produce in that way? I know the religious books say that you must become a *Brahmacharya* to find God. Do you mean to say that you can find God without love? *Brahmacharya* is merely an idea, an ideal to be achieved. Surely that which you achieve through will, through condemnation, through conclusion will not lead you to reality, to God. What shows us the way to reality, to God, is understanding and not suppression, not substitution. To give up sex for the love of God, is only substitution, only sublimation, it is not understanding. So, if there is love there is chastity; but to become chaste is to become ugly, vicious and immature.

So, look at our lives and see what we have done. We do not know how to love. Our life is merely an aspiring for position, for the continuance of ourselves through our families, through our sons and so on. But without love what is our life? Surely, mere suppression of passion does not solve anything, neither the brutal sex passion, nor the passion to become something. Surely they are both the same. You may suppress sex, but if you are ambitious to be something, it is the same urge in another direction. It is equally brutal, equally vicious, equally ugly. But a man who has real love in his heart has no sorrow and to him sex is not a problem. But since we have lost love,

implications. So, please bear in mind that in answering these questions I am not offering you any conclusions, because that which is concluded is not the truth. Life is movement, not continuity, and if we seek a conclusion or an answer, 'yes' or 'no', we are making life very small; and we want 'yes' or 'no' because our minds are small. If we recognize with our minds our smallness we can then proceed.

Question: I am very seriously disturbed by the sex urge. How am I to overcome it?

Krishnamurti: Sirs, this is an enormous problem. The implications are extraordinarily profound and wide. There are many, many things involved in this question, not merely sex, which is only of secondary importance. So, please bear with me if I do not tell you how to overcome the sex urge; but we are going to study the problem together, to see what is involved and as we study the problem, you will find the right answer for yourself. First, let us understand the problem of overcoming. How am I to overcome anger, jealousy? What happens when you overcome an enemy? It is always possible to overcome him. I may overcome you because I am stronger, but you may be stronger presently and you will overcome me. So, it is a game of constantly overcoming. That which can be overcome has to be overcome or conquered over and over again. Please see the significance of that simple statement. Whereas if you understand something, it is over. Take the wars that have been going on in Europe, the overcoming of one country by another; they have been doing that for the past two thousand years all over the world. But, if they had said 'let us sit down and understand and not fight and kill each other', surely there would have been an understanding of peace.

So, there is overcoming, but understanding is much more difficult than conquering, than controlling, because understanding requires thought, wise observation, examination and tentative approach, which means intelligence. A stupid man can always overcome something. The advice that you must strive and overcome is a real folly, which does not mean that you must give in, indulge, which is the opposite and therefore equally foolish.

So, if there is a problem, as the questioner has, of sex, we must understand it and not merely ask: how can it be overcome? That which has been overcome has to be conquered and reconquered again and again. Have you ever conquered? Did you not have to repeat it over and over again because it reappeared in ten other ways? So, surely that is not the way to understand the problem. Where there is a justification of overcoming, where there is condemnation or identification, surely there can be no understanding. You will have understanding only when you consider the problem, when you accept it, look at it, become aware of its significance completely, and even love it. Then it will yield you its significance. Then, in it there is creativeness.

Because all our pleasures are mechanical, sex has become the only pleasure which is creative. Religion has become mechanical. Authority has bound us mentally and emotionally and therefore you are blinded and blocked there. There is no creativeness in thinking about God. Is there? You do not find joy in thinking about God? It gives you emotional satisfaction. One has to be happy and joyous, which is surely the highest form of religion. But merely following authority, tradition, going to the temple, repeating *mantrams*, attending to the priests, surely that is not religion. That is mere repetition and what happens if you repeat? Your mind becomes dull, there is no joy in it. So emotionally and intellectually we are starved. We are merely repeating. This is a fact. I am not saying something extraordinary. Emotionally we are machines carrying out a routine and the machine is not creative. A man may have habits but thereby he is not creative. He may recite *mantrams*, practise *japams* and all the rest of that nonsense, but he is not creative. Such a repetitive man has merely destroyed his clarity, the power to think, the power to perceive, to understand.

See what society has done to us—our education, our routine of business, the gathering of money, the performing of awful duties and so on. In all this, is there a sense of joy? There is only perfect boredom. So, as we are hedged all-round by uncreative thinking, there is only one thing left to us, and that is sex: As sex is the only thing that is left, it becomes an enormous problem, whereas if we understood

what it means to be creative religiously and emotionally, to be creative at all moments, when you love, when you cry; when you are aware of that directly, surely then sex would become an insignificant problem.

But you see the difficulties. Passion or the biological urge is so strong, that religious societies through their tradition and laws have held you in restraint, but now that tradition and laws have little significance, you merely indulge in it.

Another enormous thing which we have lost through this struggle and through this regimentation, is love. Sirs, love is chaste and without love merely to overcome or indulge in sex has no meaning. Without love, we have become what we are today, mere machines. If we look at our faces in the mirror we can see how unformed they are, how immature we are. We have produced children without love. Often we are emotionally driven without love and what kind of civilization do you expect to produce in that way? I know the religious books say that you must become a *Brahmacharya* to find God. Do you mean to say that you can find God without love? *Brahmacharya* is merely an idea, an ideal to be achieved. Surely that which you achieve through will, through condemnation, through conclusion will not lead you to reality, to God. What shows us the way to reality, to God, is understanding and not suppression, not substitution. To give up sex for the love of God, is only substitution, only sublimation, it is not understanding. So, if there is love there is chastity; but to become chaste is to become ugly, vicious and immature.

So, look at our lives and see what we have done. We do not know how to love. Our life is merely an aspiring for position, for the continuance of ourselves through our families, through our sons and so on. But without love what is our life? Surely, mere suppression of passion does not solve anything, neither the brutal sex passion, nor the passion to become something. Surely they are both the same. You may suppress sex, but if you are ambitious to be something, it is the same urge in another direction. It is equally brutal, equally vicious, equally ugly. But a man who has real love in his heart has no sorrow and to him sex is not a problem. But since we have lost love,

sex has become a great problem and a difficult one because we are caught in it, by habit, by imagination and by yesterday's memory which threatens us and holds us. And why are we held by yesterday's memory? Again, because we are not creative human beings. Creation is constant renewal. That which was yesterday will never be again. There can only be today; not memory to which you give life. Memory is not creation, memory is not life. Memory does not give understanding, yet we hold on to it, to all the excitements of sex through memory. That gives us an extraordinary exhilaration, for that is the only thing we have. We are starved, empty; and the only thing we think of is to repeat, to recollect. What happens to a thing that is repeated over and over again? It becomes mechanical. There is no joy in it, and there is no creation.

We are hedged in by fear, by anxiety, by the desire for security; but in order to understand this problem we must look at it from every side, consider all its aspects through the everyday excitements in newspapers and cinemas, the search for pleasure and all the luxuries, the sms, the half-hints, the education that we receive, which stifles all thinking, which prepares us to become something, which is the height of stupidity. We become lawyers, glorified clerks, but this education does not give us the culture of integration, the joy in living. We do not know how to look at a tree, we merely talk about it. And religiously, what are you? You go to the temple, you perform all the ceremonies and rituals. What are they? They are mere repetitions, vain repetitions. And our politics are mere gossip, cunning deceptions. Our whole existence being all that, how can there be creation for a man who is blind? How can he see? Surely he could see if he would throw off all the rotten rubbish around him. It would be like a storm that comes and sweeps away things that are not firm, and from that freedom there would be creation. *But not only do we not want freedom, we do not want revolution either—I am not talking about political or outward revolution—we do not want the inward revolution.* We prefer to go on with this monotonous uncreative existence. We are afraid of what we might find.

So, the problem can only be solved in understanding ourselves and the utterly uncreative state we live in; and it is

only through self-knowledge that creation can come into being, and that creation is reality or God, or whatever you may call it. It cannot come into being through repetition, through pleasurable habits, either religious or sexual. To understand ourselves is extremely arduous. If you go into this problem and become aware of its significance you will see what it reveals and that is what I have just now shown—a series of imitations, a series of habits, a series of clouds, and memories. This is what this question reveals, whether you like it or not. It is a fact, that occasional break in the clouds through which you see. But most of the time we are enclosed in our own cravings, wants and fears and naturally the only outlet is sex, which degenerates, enervates and becomes a problem. So, while looking at this problem, we begin to discover our own state, that is, 'what is'; not how to transform it, but how to be aware of it. Do not condemn it, do not try to sublimate it or find substitutions, or overcome it. Be simply aware of it, of all it means; your going to the temple, your sacred thread, your repetition, your family and so on. See how monotonous, how uncreative all of it is; how stupid it is. These are facts and you must be aware of them. Then you will feel a new breath, a new consciousness and the moment you recognize 'what is', there is an instantaneous transformation; seeing the false as false is the beginning of wisdom but we cannot see the false if we are not aware, every moment of the day, of everything we say, feel and think, and you will see that out of that awareness comes that extraordinary thing called love and a man who loves is chaste, a man who loves is pure and knows life.

Question: What are your views about the implications of the belief in reincarnation?

Krishnamurti: Again, this is a vast subject. Again, as a means of self-discovery we will examine the problem; not to find a 'yes' or 'no' answer but as a means of understanding ourselves. There is so much to say and I must be brief. I can only give hints, point out certain significances. I cannot go into the whole problem, because it is immense. I do not know whether you see it in the same way I do. First of all, let us put aside the superficial responses and reactions to this question, one of which is that the person who wants a good time does not bother about reincarnation, about life

after death. That person has a good time anyway, which means that he is not afraid to act as he pleases or else he is so stupid that he feels no responsibility for his actions. After all if you have to pay for your actions you are going to be very careful. If, in the business world, you know a mistake will make you lose, whether a small or a large amount, you will be very, very careful. So, fear has been used as a means to control man; that is what religions have done, what society does through its code of morality. For the moment we are not concerned with that aspect of the question. Neither are we concerned with belief, because belief, to a man who is seeking truth, has no significance whatever, as belief is merely a security, an anchorage, a haven. A man who seeks truth must travel the uncharted seas; he has no harbours, he has no havens, he must go out to explore. So, we can put aside also this aspect of the problem.

Two things are implied in this question: continuation, and cause and effect. With regard to continuation, we must consider the idea that there is in each one of us a spiritual essence which continues. Now let us examine that idea. First, it is said in books and you also feel that there is a spiritual structure which continues after death. Please do not be on the defensive; I want to find out the truth about it. To accept an authority is to stop all thinking process. So, we are not going to accept what the sacred books say nor what you feel because after all what you feel is based on your desire for security. Now, is there a spiritual essence in man? Please consider the implications. All that is spiritual is in essence timeless, it is eternal. Surely, if that is so, the timeless, the eternal is beyond birth and death, it is beyond time and space. So, you need not worry about things that are beyond time. It is not your concern. If it is timeless, if it is eternal, it is birthless and deathless, it has no time. If it has no time, it means there is no continuity; then why do you hold on to it? *If it is timeless, it would not be continuous. But to you it is of time, because you cling to it. Therefore, it is not timeless. Therefore it is not spiritual in essence; because you have created it, therefore you cling to it. If it were real, it would be beyond your control. If it is true, you do not know it and, as I said before, if you know it, it is not true, and yet you cling to it. You say that there is a spiritual*

essence, which is the I, and that it continues, and at the same time you say it is timeless. So you have to understand the problem of continuity, which implies death, in order to know whether there is a spiritual entity or not. You have to understand death, which means you have to understand the whole problem of continuity. What continues in our every-day life? Memory through your own continuity, through your family, your belief; and as we seek continuity, psychological and physiological, we are afraid of death. Therefore, we want continuity. If continuity of this physical existence is denied us, we seek continuity in what we call 'God'. Therefore, when we talk of reincarnation, we actually seek continuity.

Now, what is it that continues? You, that is, your thinking, your memories, your day to day experiences. I identify myself with my memories, my property, my family, my beliefs and I continue and I want to be sure that that which continues, goes on. Therefore, I do not want to die, yet I know that I am going to die. So, how can I find continuity? Therefore my problem is not to discover the truth about reincarnation, but to ensure my continuity. What is it which we say continues? What is that to which we hold on so desperately, so fearfully, so anxiously? Are they not memories? Sirs, remove your memories, and where are you? And those memories are given life by constant accumulation and by constant recollection. Memory in itself has no substance, no vitality. The moment I say 'I remember' I am identifying myself with the past. That is, as long as a man who is the result of the past, is concerned with the results of the past, there must be continuity. And what happens to that which continues? Nothing, for it is only a habit. Habit is the only thing that can continue, and to which you give life from time to time. So, the thing which continues is memory, a dead thing to which you give life, which means that through a series of habits, accumulations and idiosyncracies, the experiences are translated to produce all that you wish to have continued. Moreover, that which continues decays. That which is continuous is non-creative.

So, this is what is principally involved in the question of reincarnation and this is the truth of it; not what a man says about it that it is a fact. If we really go into it, if we

are aware of its significance, we will find that, that which is spiritual is timeless and therefore beyond our reach and therefore beyond continuity; for continuity is time—yesterday, today and tomorrow. And the more we cling to that spiritual essence, the more we are really distracted from it by false action, because the timeless cannot be known by the known. You talk about the spiritual essence, which is the I, therefore you must know it, therefore it is not the truth. I am not describing something which is not. Memory by itself is a dead thing. We give it life because it gratifies us. But where there is gratification there must be continuity, and gratification soon ends, but we revive it in another form, and so we keep going. And what is continuous is not immortal, what is continuous does not renew itself. It merely continues as a habit. It is only in renewal that there is creation, there is reality; but only in ending there is renewal, not in continuity. See the trees, they drop their leaves and fresh leaves come. They do not continue. Because we are afraid, we cling to our memories and a man who is living as a continuity is a dead man and I am afraid that is what we are doing.

In this question there is also the problem of cause and effect. Are cause and effect two separate things or are they interrelated? The effect becomes the cause. So, there is never a moment which is alone either effect or cause. So, cause and effect are completely interrelated. They are not two separate processes; they are one because the effect has become the cause, and what was cause has become effect; but when we view cause apart from effect, there is an illusory time interval which leads us to the wrong conclusion and on this wrong conclusion all your philosophies are based. The cause passing through time becomes modified. The moment there is an effect, the cause cannot be in the distance. They are together although you may take time to perceive it. But the effect is where the cause is, that is, the moment you are aware of 'what is', which is the cause, the effect is also there. Therefore there is transformation. Please think over the implications and the real beauty of this. It means that if you understand 'what is' there is immediate transformation. Therefore, there is a timeless change, not a change in time. We have been trained to believe, and we expect to change, in time, to become something tomorrow.

But if you perceive the cause becoming the effect all the time and the effect becoming the cause all the time, then there is immediate understanding, therefore immediate cessation of cause. That is, Sirs, to make it very simple, when you are angry, instead of saying that you will do something about it tomorrow, if you would see immediately the cause of anger and recognize it, be aware of it, there would be immediate transformation, because then you are free from this idea, this illusion, this wrong way of thinking that only in time you can produce a result. The cause is in the effect. The end is in the means and so when we consider reincarnation we can consider it from both points of view, that of the believer and that of the non-believer, for both are caught in their beliefs, in their stupidity, and are therefore incapable of finding what is true. We must regard the problem as it is to ourselves. In being aware of this problem we see how marvellous a thing is self-knowledge, which is the beginning of wisdom. Self-knowledge, or seeing what is false in the I, is the beginning of intelligence; being aware of the stupid ways of thinking, is the beginning of understanding.

Question: From your talks it seems clear that reason is the chief means to acquire self-knowledge. Is this so?

Krishnamurti: What do you mean by reason? Can reason be separated from feeling? You have done it, because you have developed the intellect and nothing else. It is like a three-legged object, one leg of which is much longer than the others and therefore it cannot stay balanced. That is what has happened to us. We are highly intellectual. We are trained to be such. Our education, our way of life is geared to intellectual capacity in the highest degree. And we have used intellect as a means of finding reality. The books you read, the practices you follow, everything you do helps you to develop the intellect and therefore reason has become extraordinarily important in your life, in your devices and your actions. But intellect is only a part, not the whole. To understand reality and to reason are two different things. Without reason—at least what I mean by reason—we cannot live. Reason is balance, integration. Reason must understand reason to find reality. But reason as we know it now, is intellection and it can never yield anything

but disruption, as is being seen all over the world just because the world worships intellect. Intellect is producing such havoc, degradation and misery, but that is not reason. It is merely intellectuality concerned only with the superficial, responding to the immediate challenge. But there is a reason which is integration, maturity, which is completeness. Reason must go beyond itself to find reality. To put it differently, as long as there is thinking there cannot be the real, because thinking is the product of the past, thinking is of time, the response to time, therefore thinking can never be the timeless. Thinking must come to an end. Then only can the timeless be. But the thinking process cannot be violated, suppressed, disciplined; the mind must understand itself as being the result of emotions, of memory, of the past. The mind must be aware of itself and its activities. When the mind is aware of its being, you will find that there comes an extraordinary silence, a stillness, when that which is the result of the past no longer functions, in conjunction with the present. Then there is only silence, not a hypnotic silence, but the silence which is stillness. It is in this state that creativeness can take place, and it is the real. To find this stillness, reason must transcend itself. Mere intellectuality which has no significance, has nothing to do with reality and a man who is merely logical, reasonable, who uses intellect very carefully, can never find that which is. A man who is integrated has a different kind of reasoning process, which is intelligence; yet even his intelligence, his reasoning must transcend itself. Then there is stillness which is happiness, which is ecstasy.

November 30, 1947

VIII

Before I answer the many questions that have been put to me I would like to make one or two remarks. First, I wish to make a very brief resume of what I have been saying, and then I would like to suggest how the answers to the questions should be received.

It seems to me that it would be a really beautiful world, if there were no teachers and no disciples. I wonder if you have ever considered why there come to be teachers and disciples; why we look to another for enlightenment, for encouragement, for guidance? Would it not be a peaceful and orderly world, if there were neither the seeker nor the thing which he seeks? The thing which he seeks originates, does it not, from a desire for gain and therefore out of this desire comes conflict. As long as one desires to profit, whether spiritually or materially, there is conflict between man and man and if we can understand the significance of this idea of gain, perhaps, we shall find real peace, and thereby abolish the division between the teacher and the disciple and the extraordinary fear that exists between the disciple and the master though the disciple calls it love. We are caught in the process of acquisition and we realize its painful nature and so we wish to get out of that process and this gives birth to duality, does it not? That is, I want to gain and the desire to gain entails always fear and fear naturally creates duality and then the conflict of the opposites begins.

Now, does not one opposite contain the germ of its own opposite? That is, if virtue is the opposite of vice, is it virtue? I do not know if you have thought along these lines, but if you observe you will find that any opposite always contains its own opposite, that is, if vice is the opposite of virtue, virtue contains vice and therefore virtue is not the opposite of vice and so if we can understand this conflict the opposite ceases. I think it is very important to understand this point because most of us are caught in this problem of opposites, greed and non-greed, ignorance and knowledge and so on; and being caught in it, what must one do? The problem then is how to overcome it. Now, is there a problem at all or have we merely misunderstood the conflict altogether? That is, if we can understand the fact itself, anger for instance, then the conflict of its opposite ceases; that is, if we can understand 'what is', the problem of duality in which is implied the existence of evil, ceases. I think it is of the utmost importance to understand this problem of opposites as it exists in our daily life; is there ever any way out of the opposites or is the only way through the understanding of the fact itself, without any attempt to overcome

it by its opposite? In other words, 'what is' can only be understood through awareness, not through condemnation or justification; it is important to understand fear itself and not try to escape into its opposite and thereby create the conflict of the opposites.

I am not going further into this problem now because I have many questions to answer; but, I want to point out the difficulty of understanding ourselves, of being aware through self-knowledge, of what you are thinking, what you are feeling and what you are doing. If we do not understand the dual process of our own activities, our own feelings and thoughts, we have no basis for right thinking.

To be aware of ourselves is extremely arduous. It does not require book-knowledge. To know ourselves is to reach the source of wisdom and this is not mere hearsay nor mere assertion. If you begin to inquire, to be aware choicelessly, of yourself in everything that you do, you will soon discover what extraordinary depths thought can plumb and how free this awareness is.

Question: You have often talked of relationship. What does it mean to you?

Krishnamurti. First of all there is no such thing as being isolated. There is no existence in isolation. To be, is to be related and without relationship there is no existence. Now, what do we mean by relationship? It is an interconnected challenge and response between two people, between you and me, the challenge which you throw out and which I accept, or to which I respond; also the challenge I throw out to you. So, the relationship of two people creates society; society is not independent of you and me; the mass is not by itself a separate entity, but you and I in our relationship to each other create the mass, the group, the society. So, relationship is the awareness of inter-connection between two people and what is that relationship generally based on? Is it not based on so-called interdependence, mutual assistance? At least we say it is mutual help, mutual aid and so on; but, actually, apart from words, apart from the emotional screen which we throw up against each other, what is it based upon? On mutual gratification, is it not? If I do not please you, you get rid of me; if I please you, you

accept me either as your wife or as your neighbour or as your friend. That is the actual fact.

So, relationship is sought where there is mutual satisfaction, gratification; and when you do not find that satisfaction you change relationship, either you divorce, or you remain together but seek gratification elsewhere or else you move from one relationship to another till you find what you seek, which is satisfaction, gratification and a sense of self-protection and comfort. After all that is our relationship in the world and that is the actual fact. So, relationship is sought where there can be security, where you as an individual can live in a state of security, in a state of gratification, in a state of ignorance, all of which always creates conflict, does it not? If you do not satisfy me and I am seeking satisfaction, naturally there must be conflict, because we are both seeking security in each other and when that security becomes uncertain you become jealous, you become violent, you become possessive and so on. So, relationship invariably results in possession, in condemnation, in self-assertive demands for security, for comfort and for gratification and in that there is naturally no love.

We talk about love, we talk about responsibility, duty but there is really no love, and relationship is based on gratification, the effect of which we see in the present civilization. The way we treat our wives, children, neighbours friends is an indication that in our relationship there is really no love at all. It is merely a mutual search for gratification and as this is so, what then is the purpose of relationship? What is its ultimate significance? Surely, if you observe yourself in relationship with others, do you not find that relationship is a process of self-revelation? Does not my contact with you reveal my own state of being if I am aware, if I am alert enough to be conscious of my own reaction in relationship? So relationship really is a process of self-revelation, which is a process of self-knowledge and in that revelation there are many unpleasant things, disquieting, uncomfortable thoughts, activities and since I do not like what I discover I run away from a relationship which is not pleasant to a relationship which is pleasant. So, relationship has very little significance when we are merely seeking mutual gratification, but

relationship becomes extraordinarily significant when it is a means of self-revelation and self-knowledge.

After all there is no relationship in love, is there? It is only when you love something and expect a return of your love that there is a relationship. But when you love, that is, when you give yourself over to something entirely, wholly, then there is no relationship. Is relationship a mutual gratification or is it a process of self-revelation? There is no gratification in love, there is no self-revelation in love. You just love. Then what happens? If you do love, if there is such a love, then it is a marvellous thing. In such love there is no friction, there is not the one and the other, there is complete unity. It is a state of integration, a complete being. There are such moments, such rare, happy, joyous moments, when there is complete love, complete communion. But what generally happens is that love is not what is important but the other, the object of love becomes important; the one to whom love is given becomes important and not love itself. Then the object of love, for various reasons, either biological, verbal, or because of a desire for gratification, for comfort and so on, becomes important and love recedes. Then possession, jealousy and demands create conflict and love recedes further and further; and the further it recedes, the more the problem of relationship loses its significance, its worth and its meaning. So, love is one of the most difficult things to comprehend. It cannot come through an intellectual urgency, it cannot be manufactured by various methods and means and disciplines. It is a state of being when the activities of the self have ceased but they will not cease if you merely suppress them, shun them or discipline them. You must understand the activities of the self in all the different layers of consciousness. We have moments when we do love, when there is no thought, no motive, but those moments are very rare and because they are rare we cling to them in memory and thus create a barrier between living reality and the action of our daily existence. So, in order to understand relationship it is important to understand first of all 'what is', what is actually taking place in our lives, in all the different subtle forms and also what relationship actually means. Relationship is self-revelation and it is because we do not want to be revealed to ourselves that we hide in comfort and then rela-

tionship loses its extraordinary depth, significance and beauty. There can be true relationship only when there is love, but love is not the search for gratification. Love exists only when there is self-forgetfulness, when there is complete communion, not between one or two, but communion with the highest, and that can only take place when the self is forgotten.

Question: The Theosophical Society announced you to be the Messiah and world teacher. Why did you leave the Theosophical Society and renounce the Messiahship?

Krishnamurti: I have received several questions of this kind and I thought I would answer them. It is not frightfully important, but I will try to answer them.

First of all let us examine the whole question of organizations. There is a rather lovely story of a man who was walking along the street and behind him were two strangers. As he walked along, he saw something very bright and he picked it up and looked at it and put it in his pocket and the two men behind him observed this and one said to the other: "This is a very bad business for you, is it not?" and the other who was the devil answered: "No, what he picked up is truth. But I am going to help him organize it". You see it!

Can truth be organized? Can you find truth through an organization? Must you not go beyond and above all organizations to find truth? After all why do all spiritual organizations exist? They are based on different beliefs, are they not? You believe in one thing and somebody else believes in it too and around that belief you form an organization and what is the result? Beliefs and organizations are forever separating people, keeping people apart; you are a Hindu, I am a Muslim, you are a Christian and I am a Buddhist. Beliefs throughout history have acted as a barrier between man and man, and any organization based on a belief must inevitably bring war between man and man as it has done over and over again. We talk of brotherhood, but if you believe differently from me I am ready to cut your throat; we have seen it happen over and over again.

Are organizations necessary? You understand that I am not talking about organizations formed for the mutual con-

venience of man in his daily existence; I am talking of the psychological and the so-called spiritual organizations. Are they necessary? They exist on the supposition that they will help man to realize truth and they are a means of propaganda: you want to tell others what you think, or what you have learned, what appears to you to be a fact. And is truth propaganda? What is truth to someone, when propagated surely ceases to be the truth for another. Does it not? Surely, reality, God or whatever you call it, is not to be propagated. It is to be experienced by every one for himself and that experience cannot be organized; the moment it is organized, propagated, it ceases to be the truth, it becomes a lie, therefore a hindrance to reality, because after all, the real, the immeasurable cannot be formulated, cannot be put into words, the unknown cannot be measured by the known, by the word, and when you measure it, it ceases to be the truth, therefore it ceases to be the real and therefore it is a lie, and therefore generally propaganda is a lie. And organizations that are supposed to be based on the search for truth, founded for the search of the real, become the propagandists' instruments, and so they cease to be of any significance; not only this particular organization in question but all spiritual organizations, become means of exploitation. They acquire property and property becomes awfully important; seeking members and all the rest of that business begins; they will not find truth for the obvious reason that the organization becomes more important than the search for reality. And no truth can be found through any organization because truth comes when there is freedom and freedom cannot exist when there is belief, for belief is merely the desire for security and a man who is caught in his need for security can never find that which is.

Now, with regard to Messiahship, it is very simple. I have never denied it and I do not think it matters very much whether I have or have not. What is important to you is whether what I say is the truth. So, don't go by the label, don't give importance to a name. Whether I am the world-teacher or the Messiah or something else is surely not important. If it is important to you then you will miss the truth of what I am saying because you will judge by the label and the label is so flimsy. Somebody will say that I

am the Messiah and somebody else will say that I am not a
where are you? You are in the same confusion, in the
same misery, in the same conflict. So, surely, it is of very
little significance. I am sorry to waste your time on this
question. But whether I am or I am not the Messiah is of
very little importance. But what is important is to find out
if you are really earnest, whether what I say is the truth and
you can only find out whether what I say is truth by examining
it, by being aware now, of what I am saying and finding out
whether what I am saying can be worked out in daily
life. What I am saying is not so very difficult to understand.
The intellectual person will find it very difficult because his
mind is perverted and a man of devotion also will find it
extremely difficult, but the man who is really seeking will
understand because of its simplicity. And what I am saying
cannot be put into a few words and I am not going to attempt
to say it in a few words because my answers to the questions
and the various talks which I have given will reveal if you
are interested in what I am saying.

Question: On two or three occasions in the course
of the talks I have attended, I have become conscious, if I
may venture to describe the experience properly, of standing
in the presence of one vast void of utter silence and soli-
tude for a fraction of a second. It feels as though I am at
the entrance but dare not step into it. What feeling is this?
Is it some hallucination, self-suggested, in the present stormy
turbulent condition in which our daily life is passed?

Krishnamurti: There is always the danger, is
there not, when one feels very strongly that one gets caught
up in that feeling. That is how propaganda works, is it not?
If you hear over and over again that you must destroy the
Muslim or the Christian or the Buddhist or the German and
when it is repeated endlessly, one is caught in that noise of
repetition and swept off into certain kinds of action. But,
during these talks and discussions there have been moments
when we discussed and felt very deeply, when we perceived
for ourselves certain states of consciousness and because we
reached a point of great understanding and great depth, there
was silence, there was no noise. It was absolute silence. But
it becomes hallucination, if it is due to self-hypnosis; that is,

if you yourself, during the discussion or talk, have not followed it and experienced it directly for yourself. Then such silences, such extraordinary states of being become escapes from the ordinary storm, from the every day conflict of existence. So, there is always the danger of being influenced by another for the good as well as for the bad. But, the fact that you have been influenced indicates that you can be influenced and therefore the question is not whether you should or should not be influenced for the good, but whether you should be influenced at all. If you can be influenced for the good, you can also be influenced for the bad; we have seen it happen over and over again and the bad wins more often than the good as indicated by the repeated wars and catastrophes that go on in the world almost constantly.

So, the problem is not whether you should enter this thought, this silence, this creative state of being, but whether you have come to it through understanding or through influence, through persuasion or through your own careful, wise experience and understanding. Unless you have come to it through your own understanding, not merely intellectually and verbally, it has no meaning, for really there is no such thing as intellectual understanding; understanding is complete, whole and not partial. But if you come to that stillness through understanding, through being aware, it brings about the cessation of those conflicts and then through that understanding there is quietness and in that quietness and in that solitude, in that loneliness, there is reality. It is not that you are afraid to enter it, you cannot enter it. It must come to you, because if you go to it, you can only go to the known. If it comes to you it is the unknown, therefore the real. But, if you go to it, you have already formulated what it is and therefore that towards which you go is the known and therefore not the real. Therefore it must come to you. All greatness, like love, comes to you. If you pursue love it will never come; but if you are open, still, not demanding, it will come.

So, the question of influence is really very important because we all want to be influenced, we all want to be encouraged, because in ourselves we are uncertain, we are confused. And this is where the danger lies, in looking to another for clarification, for understanding. Clarification and

understanding cannot be given to you by another, no matter who he is. Understanding or clarification comes when the mind is single, free, not distracted by effort. When you are interested in something, keen about it, you give your whole being to it. You are not distracted and in that giving of yourself, in order to find out what is true there comes that quietness, that amazing creative emptiness, that absolute silence, unenforced and uninvited, and in that silence the real comes into being.

Question: You have said that a mind in bondage is vagrant, restless, disorderly. Will you please explain further what you mean?

Krishnamurti: To understand this question we must consider the whole problem of meditation and I hope you will not be too fatigued to follow this question and the things involved in the problem itself. I do not know if you have noticed that a mind that is in bondage, held by an idea or by a problem, is always restless, because it is always seeking an answer to the problem. Therefore it is always wandering. A mind that is in prison is always seeking freedom and therefore it is restless, but if it questions the prison itself, the bondage itself, then it is quiet because then it is pursuing the truth of that bondage and therefore not wandering away from the problem; the bondage is the problem itself.

The moment you are aware of a bondage, what happens? You want to free yourself from it. You want to understand it and therefore you are striving to do something about it. That means restlessness, disorder, vagrancy; but if you are interested, not in the solution of the problem but in the problem itself, which contains its own answer, then surely the mind becomes free, concentrated, because it no longer seeks a solution, but understands the problem itself; therefore the mind becomes extremely effective, clear and capable of pursuing swiftly every moment.

So, meditation then is the understanding of the problem itself which contains its own answer. Meditation is not mere repetition of words, mantrams, japams, or sitting in front of a picture or an image. Meditation is not prayer or concentration, as I explained before. Meditation is thought freeing itself from time because through time the timeless can-

not be comprehended, and as the mind is the product of time, thought must cease if the real is to be. And the whole process of meditation causes thought to come to an end and it is very important to comprehend this, because thought is the product of time, the experience of yesterday, thought is caught in the net of time and that which is of time can never comprehend that which is timeless, the eternal.

So, our problem then is to understand that the mind which is constantly creating time, is the product of time and therefore whatever it produces, whatever it fabricates, whatever it formulates, whatever it creates, is of time, whether it creates the *Paramatman*, or the *Brahman* or an idea or a machine. As thought is founded upon the past which is time, it cannot understand the timeless and therefore meditation is a process of freeing thought from time, which means that thought must come to an end. Have you ever experimented with it? Have you not found how extraordinarily difficult it is for thought to come to an end because no sooner does one thought come into being than another pursues it, and so thought is never completed; and meditation is to carry one thought through right to the end, because that which ends knows renewal, that which is continuous is of time and therefore in that there is no renewal.

How then can one complete thought? This is the problem, for that which is complete has no continuity. That which is complete has an ending and therefore a renewal. So, how is thought to come to an end? Thought can only come to an end when the thinker understands himself; the thinker and the thought are not two separate processes. The thinker is the thought, and the thinker separates himself from his thought for his self-protection, for his continuance, for his permanency and therefore the thinker is continually producing thought which is transforming, changing and gratifying. So, you have to understand the thinker, which means the thinker is not separate from the thought. Remove the thoughts, where is the thinker? Remove the qualities and where is the self, remove a man's property, his qualities, where is he? He is non-existent. Similarly remove the thoughts of the thinker, where is the thinker? Surely there is no thinker when the thought process is removed, which means we must complete every thought that arises whether

good or bad; and to complete every thought through to its end is extremely arduous because it involves a slowing down of the mind. As a fast revolving motor cannot be understood save through being slowed down, so too, a mind which is to understand itself must slow itself down. Again, it is a very arduous task to have a mind go slowly, so that you can follow every thought through. But most of our minds are not moving, they are only vagrant, they are all over the place, disjointed, disorderly, confused; and to bring order out of that confusion and vagrancy, you will have to follow each thought through. In order to follow each thought through, write it down and you will see. Experiment with it, and you will see. Write down every thought if only for a period of two minutes. As in the case of a film, the quick movements cannot be followed and only when the film is slowed down can you follow the movements. Similarly a mind that is too fast, I should not say 'fast',—because most of our minds are not fast, they are disjointed, wandering, vagrant, — such a mind can only be understood by slowing it down and it can only be slowed down by pursuing every thought as it comes. As you are listening to me your mind is slowed down and not wandering because you are following my thoughts; and as I am concentrated on what I am talking about, and as it is not mere intellection or verbal assertion, but an actual experience, you are following it actually, which indicates that you can slow down your mind and follow each thought through. But since you cannot be with me all the time, I suggest, you write down every thought and experiment with it and you will see what an extraordinary thing takes place. Your condemnations, your identifications or prejudices, etc., will come out before a consciousness that is empty and one that is now capable of complete silence. A consciousness that is filled with all kinds of memories, traditions, racial prejudices, national demands, can never be still. And you will see that in that process, when thought frees itself from time, it is not possible to indulge in certain activities.

The other day a man came to see me and he wanted to find 'peace' as he called it, peace of mind. He wanted to find God and he also stated that he was a speculator. That is what we too want. We all want peace of mind, happiness, love and tranquillity and yet we are caught in those activities

that are not quite orderly, that are not peaceful; we are caught in viciousness, in professions that are destructive such as of the lawyer, the soldier, the police, and so on. So, the understanding of the process of the mind will itself create a crisis in your daily life and you do not have to invite a crisis. It will create it and if you pursue further that crisis, then when the storm ceases there comes quietness like that of the pool when the breeze stops. So, the problems that are self-created come to an end, and there is silence, a silence that is not induced or compelled, but a silence which is free from all problems and in that silence that which is unutterable comes into being.

Question: Does not the belief in reincarnation explain inequality in society?

Krishnamurti: What a callous way of resolving a problem! Does it resolve the problem? Does your belief in reincarnation resolve the problem? Everything goes on; has your belief altered that suffering? You have only explained it away to suit your convenience, but inequality remains. And can inequality be explained by a belief, by a theory, whether the theory is of the right or of the left, whether it is an economic theory or a spiritual theory? When you believe in certain forms of socialism, either of the extreme left or of the modified left, does inequality cease because of the theory? Because you believe in reincarnation, that is in a progressive growth, which puts you a little higher than the other fellow because you are economically and socially better off, that theory comforts you; for you also believe that because you have worked and suffered in the past now you have earned the right to something, a spiritual bank account. Therefore you feel that you are a little superior and the other fellow is a little bit under you, until he in turn will come up but somebody will always be below and somebody always above. Surely, this is the most extraordinary way of regarding life, is it not, the most brutal and callous way of explaining it. You want explanations and explanations seem apparently to satisfy you whether they are political, or religious. Surely, reincarnation or the belief in reincarnation, is no solution for any of the difficulties. Is it? It is merely a postponement, an explanation but the facts are 'inequality', the

untouchables, the Brahmin and the non-Brahmin or the vicious commissar and the poor devil who works for the commissar; the fact remains that there is division and no kind of explanation however beautiful, however callous, however scientific is going to eliminate it.

I am sorry, some of you seem rather bored by this question but we will have to go into it. And how is this inequality to be overcome? Can inequality be wiped away by a system, economic, social or religious? Can a system, of the left or of the right, religious or any other kind, dispel the actual fact that men like to divide themselves into superiors and inferiors? Revolutions have taken place but they have not produced equality, though in the beginning they maintained that there must be equality; and yet when the revolution has been accomplished, when the froth, when the excitement is over, there is still inequality, the boss, the tyrant dictator and all the rest of the ugly business of existence. No government, no theory can wipe that out and to look to a theory, look to a belief is to be the most stupid, callous person. You look to a belief, to a system when your hearts are dry, when you have no love; then systems become important. Surely, when you love somebody, there is no equality or inequality. There is neither the prostitute nor the righteous. To the man caught up in his righteousness, there is division.

So, belief is not the solution, a system is not the way to equalize. You may equalize economically, but even then that economic equalization becomes unimportant as long as the psychological inequality exists; and this cannot be wiped out by economic systems. So, the only solution and the true one, and the lasting one, is love, affection, kindness, and mercy. But love is extremely difficult for a man who is caught up in activities of unmercy, in competition, in ruthlessness. Being caught up in gratifying means, through acquisition, he must find an explanation and reincarnation satisfies him. He can pursue his monstrous, ugly ways and yet feel that he is all right.

Sirs, belief is not a substitution for love and because we do not know love, because we do not know what love is, we indulge in theories and practices, we search for systems, economic and social or religious, that will dissolve this mon-

strous inequality. When you love there is neither the intellectual nor the dull, neither the sinner nor the righteous. And it is a marvellous thing to be so free, and only love can give that freedom and not a belief; and love is possible, only when beliefs drop away, when you are not looking to a system, when you become human and not mechanical. How little we love in our daily life! You don't love your sons, your daughters, your wives or your husbands and because you do not know them, you do not know yourselves. And, when we know ourselves more and more, we begin to understand the significance of love and love is the most extraordinary factor in life because it resolves all our difficulties. It is not a mere assertion or my say-so; but you try and drop all your aggressions, competitions, pursuits and be simple and you will find love. The man who is simple does not bother to know who is superior and who is inferior, who is the master, who is the disciple because he is content with what he is and the understanding of 'what is' brings love and happiness.

Question: I have made the rounds of various teachers and I would like to know from you what is the purpose of life?

Krishnamurti: It is a very odd fact in life, this pursuit of gurus. You know how ladies especially do a great deal of 'window-shopping'; they go from window to window looking from the outside to see what dress or what else they would buy if they had the money. Similarly there are many who indulge in this peculiar game of going from guru to guru, always window-shopping. What happens to such people? What happens, Sirs, when you go from guru to guru, from teacher to teacher? You get emotionally excited, stretched, and when you keep on stretching, stimulating yourself artificially, what happens? The elasticity of emotion wears out. Does it not? Keep on stretching artificially, stimulated first by one and then by another, and you lose all feeling; your elasticity, quickness, pliability are gone. Why do you go from guru to guru, from teacher to teacher? Obviously for protection, but where do you find protection always? With the teacher who gratifies you. The teacher who protects you is your own gratification. If the teacher

tells you to give up and become very simple, nice, kindly, loving, you will not go to him and if he tells you to meditate, to prostrate yourself at his feet, then you will follow him, because that is a child's game. If you feel very comfortable in his presence you go, because that again is very easy. But, if he demands something beyond your miserable comforts and security, then you go and find another teacher. So, this pursuit of the guru makes the mind dull and the emotion weak, and the original strength and vitality are lost. What has happened to all of you who have followed gurus? You have lost that extraordinary sensitivity, quickness of thought and depth of emotion. It is obvious, is it not? It is the truth.

That is one part of the question. The other part concerns the purpose of life. Apparently, the questioner must have been told by the various teachers what the purpose of life is and now, he wants to add my views to his collection, to see which is the best, which is the most suitable. Sirs, it is all so infantile, so immature. I know the person who wrote this question, a married man in a responsible position. See the tragedy of it. He wants to find out from someone, make a collection of purposes of life and choose one out of them. Sirs, it is tragic, not laughable. It shows the state of mind of the majority of us. We are mature in office, in bringing up children, in getting money, but immature in thought and in life. We do not know what it means to love.

So, the questioner wants to know what is the purpose of life. How are you going to find out? Shall I tell you what it means, or must you not find out for yourself what the purpose of life is. To remain at the office day after day, month after month, pursuing money, position, power, ambition, is that the purpose of life? Is it the purpose of life to worship graven images, to perform rituals without significance, without meaning, indulge in mere repetition? Is it the purpose of life to acquire virtue and be walled in by barren righteousness? If the purpose of life is none of these then what is it? To find what is the purpose of life, must you not go beyond all these? Then you will find out. Then you need not seek out the purpose of life. Surely the man in sorrow is not seeking the purpose of life, he wants to be free of sorrow. But you see, we do not suffer. Rather, we

suffer and we escape from our suffering and therefore we do not understand suffering. So a question of this kind indicates the extraordinary inefficiency of the thinker and the questioner. But having put that question to me, through my answer, he should now find out for himself what the purpose of life is. You see about you confusion, misery and what is the outcome of it all? How can you go to another to find out? To find out the outcome of all this confusion, you should understand the one who is confused, the man who brought about this confusion, which is yourself. This chaos is the result of our own thought, our feeling; and to understand that confusion, that misery, you have to understand yourself and as you proceed deeper and deeper in understanding yourself you will find out what is the significance of life. Merely to stand at the edge of confusion and ask what is the significance of life has very little meaning. Sirs, it is like a man who has lost the song in his heart. Naturally he is always seeking for somebody who has a song, he is enchanted by the voice of others, he is always seeking a better singer because in his own heart there is no song. There can be song in his heart only when he discards everything and ceases to follow the teacher. There comes a time when you become aware of your desires, when you do not escape from them, but understand them. It requires earnestness, it requires extraordinary serious attention and he who is already in earnest has begun to understand and in him there is hope. There is hope not in performances, not in gurus, but only in yourself.

December 7, 1947

IX

It is always difficult to communicate because the verbal expression and understanding are on different levels, are they not? We listen to words but the understanding comes only when we hear within ourselves what is being said. So, I think there is a difference between listening and hearing. Those of us who are accustomed to listening, really hardly

ing to any talk. If there is no integration between thinking, feeling and action, we cease to be really intelligent human beings. We merely live in compartments and compartmental living is really very destructive and distracting and that is what has happened in the world, and what is happening at the present time. We have developed the intellect so abnormally that we have lost all sense of proportion and sensitivity to existence.

As I have been taking different subjects at different talks, I want to take this evening briefly and naturally, the problem of suffering. Happiness is not the denial of sorrow, but the understanding of sorrow. Most of us think that suffering will make us intelligent. At least we have been told that through suffering you will awaken understanding and intelligence, that through suffering you store up knowledge, through suffering you acquire comprehension. Whereas, if you examine a little more closely you will find that suffering like pain and conflict really dulls what is and to regard suffering as a means to understanding or intelligence is really fallacious. That is what we have been accustomed to think. Does suffering bring understanding? To find out what actually takes place we must examine, must we not, what happens to us when we suffer? What do we mean by suffering? A sense of disturbance, is it not? An inward, psychological disturbance. I am not for the moment dealing with the outward suffering, diseases and so on, but inward suffering, psychological suffering as when you lose somebody, when you feel frustrated, when your existence has no meaning, when the future becomes all important, or when you regard with yearning the past as more beautiful, more happy than the present, and so on. That implies a contradiction, a dissatisfaction with the present, pain and responsibility, the sense of emptiness, the utter emptiness of relationship which has no meaning except the merely physical, the sense of void that can never be filled.

So, to understand suffering we must not take anything for granted, it seems to me, but really examine what is actually taking place in us. When we suffer, what is our natural and instinctive response? Generally is it not to run away from it? To escape through explanations, through beliefs, through theories, through the priest, through the image; we

know the various systems of escapes, the radio, the newspaper, the movie, drugs, gurus. We try anything to get away from the constant ache, pain and suffering. Even the very inquiry into the cause of suffering, is that not also an escape? If we examine it with a little care, we know very well what is the cause of suffering. We need not spend hours, days, we need not go to a guru to find out what is the cause of suffering. We know it. I do not think we need to be told what the cause of suffering is; it is obvious, is it not? But what happens when we inquire into the reason for suffering? We are really escaping intellectually into the cause or into the search for the cause. So, what generally happens is that we become very skillful, very clever in our escapes, but suffering continues and this becoming intelligent in escapes is called intelligent living. That is, you progress—it is called progress—through the change of objects of escape, but suffering, in some way or other, continues.

So, how is suffering to be understood? Merely to inquire into the cause is stupid, for obviously we know what it is; our everyday stupid existence, our prejudices our greeds, our pettiness, our desire to continue. So, it is merely information and it is of no significance when we begin to understand what suffering is. You do not have to run away from it. The more you are familiar with it, the more you are acquainted with it, the more you love it, the more you invite it, talk with it, sleep with it, the more it gives off its perfume, its significance. But the moment you run away from it, whether through your intellect or through superstition, science or romance, suffering continues.

So, suffering is really to be understood and not overcome, because any form of overcoming can be conquered again; suffering can only be understood through self-knowledge, which is right thinking. And right thinking is not possible when you condemn suffering or become identified with it, because that which you condemn, you push away, that with which you identify, you accept; but to understand suffering you have to live with it, take it as it is. You do not deny beauty, but you accept it. Similarly if we deny suffering we also deny beauty, happiness; because happiness is not the opposite of suffering and beauty is not the denial of the ugly. When you deny the one you deny the other. Only right

thinking which comes through awareness of every day feeling and action, can dissolve the cause that brings about pain and suffering.

Question: I heard your last Sunday talk about duality and the pain of it, but as you did not explain how to overcome the opposite, will you please go further into it?

Krishnamurti: Let us go into it very delicately. Let us find out its enormous significance. We know the conflict of the opposites. We are caught in that long corridor of pain, always overcoming the one and trying to become the other. That is our existence. I am this and I want to become that; I am not this and I would like to be that; that is the constant struggle of everyone; of the bank-clerk, the manager, the seeker after truth. Our everyday struggle in life is based on a constant battle of becoming, of transforming this into that. So, I needn't go into more details concerning the conflict and the pain of the opposites.

Now, does the opposite exist? We know that what exists is only the actual. But the opposite is only the negative response to what is, is it not? It has no existence apart from 'what is.' That is: I am arrogant and that is a fact and the negative response to that is humility and I accept humility as an opposite because I have been told that arrogance is wrong; or I have found it to be painful; or religiously, morally, and ethically it is taboo. So, I want to get rid of arrogance, it no longer pays me to be arrogant. So, I would like to become humble, the opposite. What actually happens is that I am arrogant and I would like to become humble. Humility is an idea, not an actuality. The actual is the arrogance, the other is not, but I would like to become that other. Therefore the desire to become what I am not creates the opposite but the opposite is non-existent, it is only an ideal which I would like to realize. So, it seems to me an utter waste of time to meditate or try in some other way to become the opposite. Love is not the opposite of hate. If it is, it would not be love, because after all, an opposite has within it the seed of its own opposite; as humility is the outcome of arrogance, therefore it has the seed of arrogance. Whereas if we understood the whole significance of arrogance, then its opposite also would cease. What exists

is arrogance and if I can understand that, I need not go into the battle of becoming something.

To put it differently, the present is the result of the past and whatever the present is, it must create the future which is its opposite, yet still caught in the net of time. So, if I can understand the whole significance of the present, I see the present as the passage of the past into the future. As long as thought is caught in the conflict of the opposites, it cannot understand what is. If I want to understand what is, I must give my whole attention, my whole being to it and not be distracted by the opposites. The opposite is merely the ideal, that which is not, that which I would like to become. Therefore it is non-existent, it is merely the negative wish of what is.

So, that is one point. The second is: why do we name a feeling? Why do we name a reaction as anger, as jealousy, as envy, as hate, and so on? Why do we term it? Do you term it in order to understand it or do you term it as a means of recognizing it? Is the feeling independent of the term? Or do you understand the feeling through the term? If you understand the feeling through the term, through the word, through the name, then the name becomes important and not the feeling and would it be possible not to name the feeling at all? Would it be possible not to term it but when you do term it, what happens? You bring a framework of references to a living feeling and thereby absorb the living feeling into time, which only strengthens memory, which is the I. And what happens, if you do not name a feeling, give it a term? If you do not give that feeling, that reaction, that response a name, a term, what would happen to that feeling? Does it not come to an end? You try it and you will see what happens. You have a feeling arising or a reaction, a response to a challenge and instinctively you name it, you term it, and then what do you do? The living response is put into a frame of past references which only strengthens your memory and therefore gives continuity to the I. But if you do not give it a name, what would happen? If you experiment you will see the reaction. The feeling soon withers away. Experiment with it and try it out for yourself.

So, any response to a challenge comes to an end when

you do not name it and put it in the frame of references. Now we have only learned that a painful reaction can be got rid of that way: don't name it, it will vanish. But, will you do the same thing with pleasurable feelings? That is, if you have a pleasure and if you do not name it, it will also wither away, will it not? It will, if you have experimented with what I have been talking about and discussing in the mornings. So, pleasurable reactions and painful reactions wither away when you do not term them, when they are not absorbed into the framework of references. You will see if you experiment with it that it is a fact.

But, is love also a response, a reaction not to be named and so left to wither? It will wither if it is an opposite of hate, because then it is merely a response to a challenge; but surely it is not a response to a challenge. It is a state of being. It is its own eternity but with most of us it has an opposite. I am brutal and I must cultivate kindliness, I must become merciful, I must become generous. The becoming creates the opposite either positively or negatively. But you cannot try to cultivate love, surely. If you try to cultivate mercy, it being an opposite ceases to be mercy, also mercy contains its own opposite, hate. Love can be known surely only when the sense of becoming which creates the opposite ceases.

So, the problem of duality, which your sacred books have said you must transcend, which all your life you have struggled to transcend but in which you are still caught, seems to me, fallacious. But in the understanding of what the opposite is, duality ceases to exist. Opposite exists only when you try to avoid what is, in order to become something which is not; but in understanding what is, which for instance is arrogance with all its implications, not only at a particular level but through all the layers of one's consciousness—not only the petty official arrogance of a bureaucracy, but the whole arrogance of achievement—in understanding arrogance not as an opposite, because as I have explained, arrogance when it becomes humility, is still arrogance; in understanding arrogance in all its significance and without naming the feeling, you will see it wither away. And as love is not the opposite of hate, you cannot approach

it through the process of cultivation or becoming. That process of becoming must entirely cease before love can be.

Question: Gandhiji says in a recent article that religion and nationalism are both equally dear to man and one cannot be bartered away in favour of the other. What do you say?

Krishnamurti: I wonder what you will say. I wonder what is your response to this. Will you question your so-called leaders? Must you not criticise, question, inquire to find out the truth and not merely accept? Will you dare to criticise? Because, if you dared you would lose your job, would you not? In this question is implied the acceptance of authority; some one tells and you accept. In acceptance there is blindness and total lack of thought. It does not matter who it is that speaks. If you have lost the critical ability to inquire, to find out, you will never discover what truth is. And that is the tragedy of leaders, political or religious, because you create them, and thus there is mutual exploitation. And in India, as elsewhere, it is extraordinary to watch the growth of leaders, of tyrants, in the name of religion or in the name of politics; and the more power they have the more evil they become.

One of the points we have to bear in mind is, not to accept but to inquire, to find out what truth is; and to find out what truth is you must have an open heart and open mind and not be guided by any teacher or any politician. But you see, that means you have to think for yourself. You have to venture out into the open, uncharted seas; but we would rather be told what to think.

I am not criticising any individual, I am not talking about any specific leader, but about the whole idea of authority. Surely, Sirs, you cannot create in the bonds of authority. Where there is authority, creation ceases. You may invent mechanical things but creation as reality, ceases, and I think that is one of the curses of this country and other countries. When you have given yourself to somebody, whether it is your priest or a political leader or the man who says he is the Messiah or a messenger of God, you cease to feel, to think and as human beings you

are non-existent. Surely that is no solution to our problems, to our catastrophes, to our miseries.

Now, it is said that religion and nationalism are both dear to man and we cannot barter away one in favour of the other. Now, let us find out the truth of this, not by opposing or defending, but really find out the truth of this matter because it is truth that is going to liberate us, give us happiness, not the assertion of any one.

What do you mean by religion? Surely, it is not going to church or going to the temple and worshipping images, reading the sacred books, or belonging to any religious sect or body. Surely that is not religion. Is it? And religion is not belief. Religion implies, does it not, the search for God, for Truth, or whatever name you give it. Therefore if that is so, then organized religions are an impediment because they constrict thought and feeling by their beliefs, by their images made either by the hand or the mind, by their ruthless ceremonies and all the rest of it. So, religion is the search after Reality and not the performance of ceremonies, the reading of sacred books and so on. So, that means that religion as an organized form of belief, ceases to be religion. In the inquiry after Truth, the approach must be negative and not positive because positive action always leads to a positive end which can only be that which you know. And Reality is the unknowable and you cannot imagine it or put it into words. It is the unknown. Therefore any positive approach to the unknown will make the unknown knowable and therefore that is not the Truth. Truth is when the known ceases to be. The Eternal is approached not through time. The Eternal is when time ceases, that is when thought which is the result of time comes to an end. So, religion is not the positive; it is not dogmatic, assertive or convertive; it is not the worship of images

And what is nationalism? The feeling, is it not, of belonging to a group of people or to a country? When you call yourself a Hindu, a Musalman or a Christian, what do you do? Does it not give you a sense of well-being, to feel that you are united with something you consider greater than yourself. When I say I am an Indian there is a sense of belonging to a whole group of people, to an ancient land with all the vanity implied in it. Is it not so? I belong to my

family and it also gives me a sense of continuity; property, ownership gives me a sense of continuity. The idea gives me a sense of continuity. Therefore, through nationalism I continue, the 'mine' continues, therefore I identify myself with what is considered the larger, the whole, the country called India. In myself I am empty, shallow, poor, I am nothing; but if I identify myself with something called India, an idea, then I am well placed, I have happiness and through that idea I can be exploited, I can butcher other countries with immunity. That is what has been happening in the world; the Germans fighting the French, Hindus fighting the Muslims and so on, all in the name of nationalism, in the name of country, in the name of God, in the name of Peace. Because I like to be identified with something which I call India, which is really myself enlarged, and when you attack that I am ready to kill you because without it I am not. Therefore I invest in nationalism all my feelings, it takes the place of religion, and that is what is happening now; Gods are disappearing and the States are taking their places. Both are ideas and therefore you have nothing to lose; that you barter one for the other is of very little importance, because you are really, fundamentally seeking continuance through a concept, and whether it is India or God or Germany or something else does not matter as long as you, as an entity, can continue in some form.

So, nationalism like organized religion has brought division between man and man. Through nationalism you can never find brotherhood. If you are a nationalist and try to become brotherly you are living in deceit because you cannot be identified with one and deny the rest. The moment you identify yourself either with a belief or with a country you are the creator of wars. You may speak of brotherhood but you live in a state of suppression, therefore you are causing wars. I do not see much difference between nationalism and organized religion. Both have brought misery to man, both have created division, both have spread destruction, conflict; because through beliefs and through patriotism they separate man from man. Surely, you must go beyond these petty images created by the mind or by the hand, to find Truth, must you not? You must cease to be nationalistic however thrilling it may be, however stimulating and you

must cease to belong to any particular religion in order to find Reality, must you not? As both nationalism and organized religion are inventions of the mind, of time, to understand the timeless, you must be free of time. This is extremely difficult in the modern world as the modern world is geared for war, total war, total destruction which nationalism or organized religion render inevitable; therefore a man who desires to find Truth must leave these two behind, for Truth is to be found not in an image made by the hand or by the mind, but when thought ceases; the ending of thought is the ending of time. Truth can only be understood through self-knowledge, and not by following the assertion of any leader.

Question: You have talked of exploitation as being evil. Do you not also exploit?

Krishnamurti: I am glad that you have still the capacity to criticise. It is through that we will find Truth and not by hiding behind the defence of words. Yet, most of us have erected walls of words which it is very difficult to penetrate. I am quite willing to expose myself, and I will, and you can have a great deal of fun.

What do you mean by exploitation? Have you thought about it, I wonder, or merely read about it in books and so are able to repeat to me or to yourself assertions of the left or of the right. What does exploitation mean? Does it not mean using another for your own profit either socially or psychologically? Society, as it is established at present, makes it inevitable, unfortunately, to use others; the shirt which I put on and the *kurtha* I am wearing are the result of exploitation and how can any-one, in a society which is constructed in this manner, cease to exploit? You understand what I mean by exploitation; using another for your own personal benefit, personal gain, personal achievement. All that I can do is to say to myself that I will have a minimum, and I have decided what my minimum shall be. It is of very little importance to me whether I have much or little. To have much is a bothersome thing, as people who have much will tell you. The limiting of the needs can only come about when the needs are not used for psychological purposes, that is, when I do not use the essentials of life as a means to psychological contentment, or psychological gratification. The

use of property as a means of self-aggrandizement, I call exploitation. But exploitation ceases when I use the essentials as essentials and no more; I hope you understand that point.

Exploitation begins when needs become greed, when needs become psychological necessities. The needs which are food, clothing and shelter have very little significance in themselves except to feed one, to clothe one and shelter one. Surely exploitation ceases when the needs do not go over into the psychological field because, after all, when you examine the needs they are food, clothing and shelter and a happy man is not bothered by these, because he has other riches, he has other treasures. The man who has no other treasures, makes the sensate values predominant and this creates such havoc in the world. So, if I may be personal, as I do not use the essentials of life for psychological aggrandizement I am really not exploiting anyone. You may call me an exploiter, but in my heart I know I am not.

The problem of psychological exploitation is much more difficult. Psychologically, we depend on things, on beliefs or on ideas. That is, psychologically, things, relationship and ideas become important as long as things, relationship and ideas fill our psychological emptiness; that is, being inwardly poor, insufficient, fearful, uncertain, we seek security in things, or in relationship, or in ideas. That search for security in things, in beliefs, in ideas is the beginning of real exploitation. We know the result of seeking psychological security in things; it leads to war, to destruction, to such social chaos and degradation as exist in India and elsewhere at the present time. Things have become extraordinarily important to you, because they fill your psychological emptiness. You are the things, take away the things, where are you? So, you must have a bank account, it is your bank account, you are the owner. And in relationship too, what happens? Being psychologically empty you depend on your husband, on your wife, on your friends. So, dependence becomes very important, therefore there is jealousy, fear, possessiveness and all the bother of trying to overcome possessiveness. Similarly when you are inwardly empty, ideas and beliefs become extraordinarily important, the leader, the messenger, the saviour become important.

by things. When you realize that emptiness and do not try to escape from it through any means, then that which is, is transformed.

Question: What is the difference between surrendering to the will of God and what you are saying about the acceptance of what is?

Krishnamurti: Surely there is a vast difference, is there not? Surrendering to the will of God implies that you already know the will of God. You are not surrendering to something you do not know. If you know Reality, you cannot surrender to it. You cease to exist. There is no surrendering to a higher will. If you are surrendering to a higher will then that higher will is the projection of yourself, for the Real cannot be known through the known. It comes into being only when the known ceases to be. The known is a creation of the mind because thought is the result of the known, of the past and thought can only create what it knows and therefore what it knows is not the eternal. That is why when you surrender to the will of God you are surrendering to your own projection; it may be gratifying, comforting, but it is not the Real. To understand what is, demands a different process; perhaps the word process is not right but what I mean is this: to understand what is, is much more difficult, it requires greater intelligence, greater awareness, than merely to accept or give yourself over to an idea. To understand what is does not demand effort and as I pointed out in my earlier talks, effort is a distraction. To understand something, to understand what is, you cannot be distracted, can you? If I want to understand what you are saying, I cannot listen to music, to the noise of people outside, I must give my whole attention to it. So, it is extraordinarily difficult and arduous to be aware of what is, because our very thinking has become a distraction. We do not want to understand what is. We look at what is, through the spectacles of prejudices, of condemnation or of identification, and it is very arduous to remove these spectacles and to look at what is. Surely, what is, is a fact, is the Truth and all else is an escape, is not the Truth, as we said earlier this evening. To understand what is, the conflict of duality must cease, because the negative response of becoming something other than what is, is the

denial of the understanding of what is. If I want to understand arrogance, I must not go into the opposite, I must not be distracted by the effort of becoming, or even by the effort of trying to understand what is. If I am arrogant, what happens? If I do not name arrogance, it ceases, which means that in the problem itself is the answer and not away from it. So, it is not a question of accepting what is, you do not accept what is, you do not accept that you are brown, because it is a fact; only when you are trying to become something else you have to accept. The moment you recognize a fact, it ceases to have any significance; but a mind that is trained to think of the past or of the future, trained to run away in multifarious directions, such a mind is incapable of understanding what is. But without understanding what is, surely you cannot find what is Real and without that understanding, life has no significance, life is a constant battle wherein pain and suffering continue. The Real can only be understood by thinking, by understanding what is. It cannot be understood if there is any condemnation or identification; the mind that is always condemning or identifying cannot understand. It can only understand that within which it is caught. The understanding of what is, being aware of what is, reveals extraordinary depths in which is Reality, happiness and joy.

December 14, 1947

X

There are so many problems, and especially at this time when there is so much confusion, when each one, each society, each group of people or nation, is seeking security at the expense of others, it seems to me very important to find out how to think rightly as a problem arises, how to confront the problem rightly; what is important is not what we should think about the problem, nor what our attitude should be towards the problem, but *how* to think about it. We are accustomed to being told what to think, in what manner to approach a problem but we do not know what thinking is. So, it seems to me very important to find out what is right

thinking because the various problems that arise, the problems which confront us constantly, demand right thinking.

There is a right solution for each problem but it requires right thinking and not the mere desire to solve the problem. The point is not what to think, but how to think rightly. I would like to discuss this with you if I may, this evening, for there can be right action only if there is right thinking. If we do not know how to think we do not know how to act.

So, what is thinking? I wonder if you have ever asked yourself that question. What is thinking? As I have often said, you don't have to wait for an answer from me but let us think over the problem together because I do not consider this to be a lecture or a talk or a discourse in which you are merely listeners; you are participants in this discussion; let us therefore think together about each problem. So, don't merely wait to hear an answer from me.

What is thinking, what is the process of thinking? As we know it, it is a response to memory, is it not? You have certain memories and they leave certain marks and to this residue you respond. Memory thus is accumulation of the residue of experience. So, thinking, which is the response to memory, is always conditioned and as we know, that is the actual fact, our daily existence. That is, you have an experience and you translate that experience according to previous memories and so the experience, which has been translated, is gathered as memory and according to that memory you respond and this is called thinking. Surely such thinking only strengthens conditioning, which only produces more conflict, more pain and more sorrow.

That is, memory is constantly responding to the residue of experience which we call memory. It is responding to a challenge and this challenge and response to memory we call thinking, because life is a series of challenges and responses and the response is always conditioned by memory and that response to memory we call thinking. But the challenge is always new, it is never the old and our thinking is always old because it is the response of the past. So, believing is not thinking, believing is only conditioned thinking and conditioned experience—I am using the ordinary word conditioning and not the technical one. If you believe in something, you experience it and your experience is conditioned because

it is based on a belief which is also conditioned. So belief is not thinking at all, it is only a response to a memory. So, that is what we are doing in our daily life if we examine ourselves. You have the experience which leaves a residue which is memory and according to that memory you think, and that response which we call thinking is always conditioned because belief is always conditioned memory.

So, our thinking, which is the response to a challenge which is ever new, is always conditioned and therefore produces further conflict, further suffering and further pain. This is a fact, this is our daily existence. When we say we are thinking, that is what we mean. But, is that thinking? What then is thinking? When we use the word thinking in our daily life it is thinking based on memory, thinking which is a response and a reaction to memory and that response to memory comes from a challenge. You see a picture, you criticise it according to the background you have. You listen to music and you interpret it according to the traditions and according to the frame of reference you have. If you have had western training in music you will not respond to Indian music.

So, this is what we call thinking, a series of responses to memory and therefore thinking is always conditioned and that is a fact. Now, I ask myself, and I hope you are doing it too, is that thinking? These responses to memory, is that thinking? So, thinking, as we know it, is it really thinking or merely responding to memory and therefore not thinking? What then is thinking? Don't tell me it is response to memory, but what is thinking? Have you ever thought about it? Have you ever sat down and said to yourself what is thinking, what do you mean by thinking? You say ordinarily it is a response to memory. But is that thinking? Surely that is not thinking. So what is thinking?

Now, as it is a new problem, when you are asked a question what is thinking what do you do? It is a new question, a new problem presented to you and how do you respond to it? When you are asked what is thinking, what is your response? You have never thought about it. So, what happens? You are silent, aren't you? Please follow this very carefully. There is a new problem presented to you: what is thinking; and as you have never thought about

it and since it is new there is naturally a hesitancy, a sense of quietness and a stillness of observation. Is there not? You are watching, you are not translating, you are very alert and your mind is extremely concentrated if the question is vital and interesting, which it is. If you observe yourself when this question is asked you, you will see that your mind is not asleep, but very alert and very conscious, yet passive. It is waiting to find an answer. Now, that alert yet passive state is surely thinking because that is not conditioned thinking. There is passive, alert awareness, isn't there? Because your mind is very quiet and because it is confronted with a new problem, it is not asleep, but very alert and aware yet passive; it is not active because it does not know the answer, it is not even seeking an answer because it does not know. So that state of awareness, passive awareness is really thinking, is it not? It is the highest form of thinking because there is no positive comprehension, there is no conditioned response, it is a state of negation. Would it not be possible to meet every problem in this way, anew, because then the problem gives its significance; then you meet a problem, as sorrow, for instance and it will give its significance and therefore the problem ceases. But when you try to solve the problem by what you call thinking which is only response to memory, then because memory is conditioned, you further complicate the problem.

You can experiment with this for yourself very simply and you will see how remarkably it works. For instance, you are in front of a modern painting. Your instinctive response is that you don't understand it and you push it aside, or else you ask who painted it, and if it is some big name you say it is very good; or again according to your training, you translate the picture. You respond according to your background or your conditioning. But suppose you put aside, if you can, the training, the classical training you have had and remain very quiet, very passive but alert in front of the picture. Does not the picture then tell you, give you its significance? So passive awareness is surely the highest form of thinking because you are so receptive, so alert that the picture conveys its meaning to you. So, similarly if we could meet each problem with this alert, passive awareness which you experience now, when I ask you what is thinking, you are puzzled.

you are bewildered and if you can go beyond that bewilderment, that puzzle, you say, 'I do not know.' That unknowingness is not a sleepy condition; on the contrary it is a very alert passive state of the mind in which there is deep silence waiting for the right significance.

But, what we call thinking is generally understood as a response of memory and when you meet a problem with the response of memory the problem is not understood and therefore there's still more confusion. But, if you are able to meet each problem, with this passive awareness, which is choiceless, then the problem yields its significance and therefore the problem is transcended.

Question: I dream a great deal. Have dreams any significance?

Krishnamurti: This is really an extremely important and very difficult problem because many things are implied. First of all, are we awake or partly awake, or are we asleep most of the time? When are you awake? When there is a tremendous crisis, when there is interest, when there is a problem. But when there is a problem our desire is to escape from it through different ways and thereby we put ourselves to sleep. When there is a crisis what do you do? You try to solve the crisis according to the framework of references, according to religious literature or according to a guru and that again puts you to sleep. So when there is a challenge of life, if it is pleasurable you pursue it, which is also a way of putting oneself to sleep, because the more pleasure you have the more dull you become. When the challenge of life is painful what happens? You avoid it, which again dulls the mind, you avoid it through various channels. So, constantly, when there is a challenge which demands earnest attention, clear perception, a challenge which may entail pain or pleasure, either we refuse it or identify ourselves with it to such an extent that we put ourselves to sleep. That is the ordinary process and it is only at very, very rare moments that we are awake. It is in those moments that there is no dream. In those moments when you are fully awake there is neither experience nor accumulation of experience. You are just awake and therefore the dreamer is not dreaming.

Now, what is the significance of dreams? Surely, it is this, is it not? The conscious mind, during the day, is actively engaged in either earning money, doing routine work, learning, or is occupied with some technical job. So, the conscious mind during the day, is actively busy with superficial things such as going to the temple, going to the office, having a quarrel with the wife or husband, thinking, reading, avoiding, enjoying; it is constantly active. When the mind goes to sleep what happens? The superficial mind is fairly quiet. But consciousness is not just the superficial layer. Consciousness has many, many layers, you don't have to be told what they are: hidden motives, pursuits, anxieties, fears, frustrations and so on. And these layers of consciousness can and do project themselves into the conscious mind and when it wakes up it says: 'I have had a dream.' In other words, the conscious mind is so occupied with daily activities, daily anxieties, daily fears that it is incapable of receiving intimations and hints during the day. Each of the many layers has its own consciousness and when the superficial mind becomes quiet the layers project themselves on the superficial mind and then you dream.

There are of course superficial dreams and dreams which have real significance. The superficial dreams are the dreams created by the bodily response; indigestion, over-eating, etc. So, we need not consider those. Other dreams are the intimations of the deeper layers of consciousness. Now, when you dream, what happens? It often happens that as you dream interpretation is taking place. I do not know if you have noticed it. That is, dreams are really, are they not, symbols, images, pictures which the conscious mind translates and says: 'I have dreamt this or that.' Symbols and hidden motives which when projected into the conscious are translated into symbols which convey a significance to you when you wake up. And when you dream, when you say on waking 'I have had a dream,' immediately you want to interpret it. If you are at all aware you want to know what it means. Now there is the luxury of going to a psychoanalyst, the dream expert and he will translate your dream for you after a very difficult process taking many months and costing a great deal of money. But most of us have not the money, fortunately, and we are not near any

psychoanalyst. Psychoanalysts are the new priests in the modern world. They have also their own jargon and they exploit you and you exploit them.

But, surely there is a different way of understanding. When you yourself interpret the dream, who is the interpreter? You have had a dream during the night, it has some significance, it is not just a superficial dream, it is a dream which has some worth, some meaning. Now, you want to understand it, which means you want to translate it, you want to go into it. Now, how do you understand a dream? You try to pursue it and find out its significance and what happens? You try to interpret it. You are interpreting it and therefore you, being the conditioned, active superficial mind, are not able to pursue it, understand it. You can only translate it, interpret it according to your like and dislike. But the dream gives you very little of its significance, its meaning. If you pursue your dream you will see what I mean, because you, the interpreter, are very anxious to find out what it means; therefore you are agitated; therefore you cannot understand it. But, if the interpreter is fully alert yet passive, then the dream reveals its significance. That is the only way of dealing with dreams. The conscious mind wants to understand the significance of the dream which is the intimation of the many layers of consciousness; so if the dreamer is passively alert, quiet, then the dream begins to yield its significance. But if you pursue it and say, 'I must understand it,' the conscious mind becomes agitated and translates the dream according to its conditioning. Therefore it can never understand it. So, how the dreamer, the interpreter, regards the dream is of the highest importance.

Then there is another problem. The other problem is, as the interpreter, the dreamer is constantly unaware, how can it be possible to free thought from all dreams, so that there will be no interpreter. That is, why should the mind, the conscious mind, always be dreaming? Why should you have to go through these dreams and all the bother of interpretation, and the anxiety on the part of the interpreter? Is there any way of not dreaming at all? Because the moment the interpreter, the dreamer, intervenes in the understanding of the significance of the dream, he is bound to misinter-

pret it. He can only translate according to his own conditioning which is always pleasurable and therefore he avoids anything that is painful. Is there not a way of transcending all dreams, because dreams, as I said, are intimations given by the many, many layers of consciousness to the superficial layer, of what they want, what they desire, what their intentions are.

So, the problem is then, how to transcend, how to understand fully, deeply, all the intimations of the various layers of consciousness so that you don't have to wait for the night to have a dream and then translate it and all the rest of it. Is it possible to understand the whole content of consciousness, to free it so that it need not project itself upon the superficial mind when asleep? Is it possible to empty the whole of consciousness so that the conscious mind understands fully? The superficial then is the profound. There are many layers of consciousness and when one of these layers projects upon the conscious, superficial layer, its intimations, which the conscious mind calls dreams, then the conscious mind tries to interpret them and suffers all the anxiety of interpretation. I do not know if you have gone through that.

Now, my question is: is it possible for the conscious mind to be so alert, so passively aware during the day that all the intimations are translated as they arise? In other words, can you be so consciously, so choicelessly aware—the moment you choose, you become the interpreter—can you be so passively aware that all the layers of consciousness are giving you their intimations all the time, so that all of consciousness is one whole without layers? This is possible only when the conscious mind is not battling with problems, when the conscious mind is not *made* still, but is still. If you will experiment you will see how extraordinarily interesting this is. When the conscious mind is quiet it may be doing superficial things but its quietness is not disturbed by the superficial activities. Then you will see that the more you are aware, the more you are passively observant, negatively watchful, choicelessly alert, the more the contents of the unconscious, of the many layers, come to the surface. You don't have to interpret them because the moment they arise they are being understood. If you experiment, you will feel

an extraordinary freedom because your whole being, your consciousness, which now is broken up, becomes integrated. There is no longer any struggle in your consciousness, it is therefore love, it is completely whole, unbroken. Surely, that is freedom, and all those deep hidden layers of consciousness are out, open, free and therefore there is no necessity for dreams.

When therefore there are no dreams, consciousness can penetrate deeper and deeper into itself, for dreams are an indication of disturbance. But when there is no disturbance and the body is very quiet during sleep, when the mind is still, when the conscious mind is comparatively still, you will find upon waking, you had not dreamt, but that a renewal has taken place, a renewal which is constantly going on because there is always an ending.

The farmer, the toiler, tills the field in the spring time. Then he sows, then he harvests and allows the field to lie fallow during the winter months. That fallowness of the soil is regeneration because it is exposed to the sun, the snow, the storm. It renews itself. So, similarly when the conscious mind has struggled, sown, harvested, it must lie fallow. Such fallowness is its own creativeness. It renews itself and this can be done every day, not only at the end of the season.

Now, when you have a problem you struggle with it and you don't end it, you carry it over to the next day. But if you end it then, that is, if you live the four seasons in one day, then when you wake up you find there has been a renewal, a freshness, a newness which you have never felt before. It is not the renewal of desire, the renewal of your problems, of property, marriage and all that kind of thing, but the renewal to face things anew. So, dreams have an extraordinary significance. But their significance is not understood if there is the interpreter and as there is the interpreter he is always translating the dream according to his conditioning. So, is it possible to remove the interpreter? It is possible only when the conscious mind is active, yet passive, when it is passively aware. Then, in that new awareness, in that passive, choiceless state, the whole content of the many layers of consciousness is understood, because that consciousness is no longer

broken up but is whole and integrated; it is free; and it can renew itself constantly and face anew everything that confronts it.

Question : We see the significance of what you say, but there are many important problems which demand immediate attention, such as the struggle between capital and labour.

Krishnamurti : We all know that there are immediate problems which need immediate solutions and answers. That is obvious, especially in a society which is chaotic, confused, which is the result of industrialization and so on. Those problems demand immediate attention; capital, labour, transportation and all the rest of it. Now what is it that we are saying that is so impracticable, that cannot deal with the immediate problems? That is the implication in this question. That is, the questioner says 'Yes, I agree with what you say but how am I to solve the immediate problems?' The implication is that he has not found in what we have been saying any application to the immediate problems. He does not know how to deal with the problems which demand immediate attention.

Now, either we deal with the problems from the point of view of reform or from the point of view of right thinking. If I am dealing with problems merely from the point of view of reforming, those reforms need further reforming, but if I am dealing with problems from the point of view of right thinking, then I shall be able to deal with them directly. So, we are not concerned with reforms, are we? It is very important to decide this for yourself because you want reform. there is an urgency to remedy the lack of food, to abolish child-marriage, to permit widow remarriage; you know all the immediate problems. Are you dealing with them with the mentality of the reformer, whose attitude is entirely different from that of the man who wants to deal with the entire problem of human existence? To be concerned merely with reform, is one way of dealing with problems. Then you are not concerned with the purpose of man, you are merely concerned with the immediate problem of man, and that is all you care about. That is the attitude of the politician. So, such an attitude only leads to confusion, more confusion, more struggle, more misery which is evident in

society at the present time. Or, are you looking at problems like starvation, nationalism, economic frontiers, and at our daily existence which creates innumerable problems, from the point of view of a man who is seeking for the whole meaning of existence? These two points of view are diametrically opposed.

So, from which point of view did you put this question? Please don't answer, there are too many people. If you are dealing from the point of view of the reformer then there is no answer because you have to reform, you have to compromise with the left and with the right, and with corruption, which means that you are also partly corrupted and so on and so on. It is like a man who says: If I do not have an army my country will be overrun by the enemy; but I also believe in pacifism, I believe in brotherhood. He is really a reformer. He has compromised because he says: 'If I don't have an army somebody will come and conquer me'. So, he creates an army, he participates in war because the very existence of an army is an indication of preparation for war and all the problems connected with the results of war and so on.

Now, similarly when you deal with the problem of labour and capital what is involved in it? The capitalist is a thorough-going exploiter. He will pay the least to get the most, which we all know; but if the labourer can get to the top, he will do exactly the same, for everything is controlled by the State and you are directed to work whether you like it or not. So, the struggle between capital and labour is a problem of power. The capitalist seeks his own security, his own safety, you know the whole business of his exploitation, and the labourer has to organize to protect himself from the ruthlessness of the man above. Therefore there are strikes, unions and so on.

So, are you approaching life from the point of view of the reformer, that is doing patch work, or are you approaching it from a revolutionary point of view, which means that you have an idea you want to carry through? Then you are not concerned with human struggle, human existence, but only with the system and therefore you believe the system will benefit man. So, you are more interested in the system than in man. Or, are you approaching the whole problem of human existence, and not merely the struggle

between capital and labour, which is the struggle between man and man, between wife and husband, between neighbour and neighbour, between group and group, between one organization and another organization? Are you approaching the problem in order to understand the true meaning of conflict, pain and suffering in man? If your approach is comprehensive, integrated, whole, then you will have an answer which is real. But if you are merely approaching the problem from the point of view of a theoretical revolutionary with a system and according to a pattern, then surely you will not solve the human ailment, nor will the reformer, the socially active person who wants to alter things to fit them into his pattern, into his framework. His reforms will have to be reformed because the reformer is not tackling the fundamental issues of the mind.

The immediate can only be understood, if we understand the timeless. The man who is concerned with the immediate can never understand the profound, for man is not merely the immediate. If he is seeking an answer to his problems in terms of time—the question implies that the problem must be settled the day after tomorrow—then such a man is not concerned with the real issues and problems, the psychological issues and problems of man; he will say: I am not concerned with your psychological problems. All I want is to feed the millions and therefore I am going to pursue ruthlessly the feeding of the millions even if I should fail to feed any. Surely there is a different approach to this problem,—the problem of necessities which are food, clothing and shelter and other psychological factors,—one which does not relate it to any particular group or system. Taking man as a whole is what very few people want to do, because they are all concerned with the immediate: immediate desires, immediate fulfillments, immediate passions. So, most of us are really concerned with the immediate. Most of us are politicians and not real seekers wishing to find out the truth of existence. Most of us want to compromise, most of us want easy settlements. But those people are not going to be the saviours of man. The man who will save humanity is he who profoundly understands himself in relation to society, in relation to his wife, to the nation, to the group and who by transforming himself in relationship brings a new under-

standing which helps to clarify the significance of society and its struggles.

Question: Are we not shaped by circumstances? Are we not really the creatures of our senses?

Krishnamurti: Again this is an enormous problem because the implications are enormous in a question of this kind. One implication is that matter is in movement within itself and therefore control of circumstances is essential, is all important. The other conception is that idea moves upon matter and therefore shapes matter. It is the religious conception. The materialistic conception is that matter is in movement within itself and produces the idea and therefore one must control circumstances, therefore the individual is not important. Whereas according to the other, the religious conception, idea shapes matter, that is God, or what you will, controls and shapes matter and therefore there is absolute value, absolute virtue, and it is the reality. The materialist, the socialist, the extreme leftist say that there is no such thing as absolute value; man is merely the product of environment and he changes his values according to environment and therefore environment controls and shapes him according to a system. These theorists force him, put him into a straight jacket of thought so that he would function effectively as a citizen in a mechanized society and so the individual is not at all important because he is merely matter to be shaped.

Don't take sides. I am not taking sides. To the rightist the individual is important only so long as there is no crisis. When there is a war, the individual is no longer important. He is brought into the war and shot. So, both the left and the right meet in moments of crisis, and the individual is sacrificed. This is what is happening in the world today. Though we believe in absolute value and that man, the individual is the sacred expression of that value, he is nevertheless sacrificed, he is regimented, he is directed in moments of crisis as a war or other national disaster. To the leftist, man is not important, the individual is not important, he may eventually become an important entity, but in the meantime he must be controlled, shaped. Now, the leftist starts with his theory, his system; and the rightist denies all that the

leftist says, and believes that God has created him. He has his bible and the leftist has *his* bible. So, both are approaching the problem with a conditioned mind, conditioned by Marx or by the Bible, Bhagavad Gita, or what you will.

If I want to find out where the truth is, how do I start? It is a fact that I am the result of my environment as you also are, obviously. You are the creature of your senses because after all you are a Hindu or a Christian or a Musalman, you are the result of your environment. You have been told to believe in God and you believe in God. You go to the temple or not according to your conditioning. Whether left or right you are conditioned, which implies environment has shaped your mind. So you are partly, not wholly, a result of your environment; and in order to find out what is true you must go deeper and deeper into the whole problem of the senses and not categorically stop at a certain point.

So, you have to experiment with yourself to find out how far your thinking, your feeling is merely sensory, your values sensate, and not accept, as the rightists do, that God is absolute, and then try to find the absolute. If you do merely accept, you are exactly like the leftist who denies because you are then merely experiencing, living, according to your conditioning. You will not find the truth, because you have arbitrarily decided in advance that there is or there is not. Whereas if you want to find the truth you must obviously begin with the senses because that is all you know. You can speculate on all the rest but in understanding the sensate values you can go deeper and deeper into the whole problem of consciousness. You don't take anything for granted, nor accept anything in order to believe. You begin experimenting and then you will find for yourself whether you are merely the result of the environmental influences or if you are the idea moving upon matter. You will find that it is neither, but that it is something else. When you put it as matter moving upon idea or idea moving upon matter, then they are put as opposites, as antithetical. As I said before, if you approach a problem from the point of view of the opposite, then the opposite contains its own opposite. After all when the left and the right are treated as opposites the left is the continuation of the right; it is the

denial of the right only at certain points but it is nevertheless the continuation of the right.

So, in order to understand this problem you cannot approach it either from the left or from the right; acceptance of the left or of the right is a denial of truth. Food, clothing and shelter are sensate values; and your thinking is obviously sensate and so are your feelings. From there you can proceed and then going deeper into the psychological process you will find there comes a silence, there comes an absolute, not a relative tranquillity. It is not sensory, not sensate, it is not self-induced. In that silence you will find truth when the mind is really still,—not only when the superficial layer of consciousness, but the whole consciousness is still, when it is not inquiring, when it is not seeking,—when it is not urged by desires. Then in that real tranquillity, which is not induced, which is not invited, you will find the Truth; but when you accept either the left or the right surely you cannot find the Truth of anything. Acceptance is the very denial of Truth.

December 21, 1947.

XI

This will be the last Sunday talk. Though I have gone over many subjects and approached our human problem from different points of view I think it may be just as well if I made, not exactly a summary, but a general survey of what we have been discussing during the last ten weeks. Naturally I cannot do it in detail and, as time is limited, I will naturally have to be very concise but I hope that those of you who have followed these discussions and talks will understand their true significance rather than accept merely the words.

We must have realized not only through newspapers but through our everyday contact with life, with our neighbours, our friends, our families, the increasing confusion and misery all around us, politically, socially, religiously; and the same confusion exists in our relationship with each other,

that is, with society. So, how are we to understand this increasing confusion and misery and bring order and happiness? I think that is what every thoughtful man is concerned with; I am not talking of those people who are concerned with systems, for they are really not thoughtful people at all; they want to impress upon people a system by means of which happiness or order could be brought about, they are concerned with systems and not with human beings. So, we are not discussing systems or organizations, but how to bring about order in this mad, chaotic world.

To go far you must begin very near, mustn't you? You must begin with what is very close, which is yourself. That is, we see this chaos about us, mounting disaster, mounting wars and terrible cruelties and misery; how are we to solve these? It is a vast confused puzzle and where must we begin to bring order and happiness? Surely with yourself, mustn't you? You are the focal point of all this chaos, surely; if we understand that, we will begin with ourselves, each one of us, I with myself and you with yourself. But, somehow we fail to realize this basic fact, that we are the important keystone in the whole structure of society.

What is the relationship between yourself and the misery, the confusion in and around you? Surely this confusion, this misery did not come into being by itself. You and I have created it, not a capitalist or a communist or a fascist society, but you and I have created it in our relationship with each other. What you are within has been projected without, onto the world; what you are, what you think and what you feel, what you do in your everyday existence, is projected outwardly and that constitutes the world. If we are miserable, confused, chaotic within, by projection that becomes the world, that becomes society, because the relationship between yourself and myself, between myself and another is society—society is the product of our relationship—and if our relationship is confused, egocentric, narrow, limited, national, we project that and bring chaos into the world.

So, what you are, the world is. So your problem is the world's problem. Surely, this is a simple and basic fact, is it not? In our relationship with the one or the many we seem somehow to overlook this point all the time. We want

anger, passion, all of which in our relationship create constant conflict from which we try to escape, and this produces further chaos, further misery.

Now as regards ideas which are part of our daily existence, beliefs and formulations, are they not distorting our minds? For, what is stupidity? Stupidity is the giving of wrong values to those things which the mind creates, or to those things which the hands produce. Most of our thoughts spring from the self-protective instinct, do they not? Our ideas, oh, so many of them, do they not receive the wrong significance which they have not in themselves? And therefore, when we believe in any form, whether religious, economic or social, when we believe in God, in ideas, in a social system which separates man from man, in nationalism and so on, surely we are giving a wrong significance to belief, which indicates stupidity, for belief divides people, doesn't unite people. So we see that by the way we live, we can produce order or chaos, peace or conflict, happiness or misery. So what we have been discussing for the past eleven weeks is directly related to our daily life, to our daily existence and is not theoretical.

To bring order out of this confusion, out of this chaos which we have projected outwardly because inwardly we are chaotic, envious and stupid, is virtue. You can only bring order and peace and happiness through self-knowledge, and not by following a particular system, either economic or religious. But to know one's self is most difficult. It is very easy to follow a system for you don't have to think very much, you give yourself over to a party, either the left or the right, and thereby close your thinking process. To be aware of the activities of your daily existence requires thoughtfulness, intelligence, awareness which very few people are willing to practice. They would rather reform society than understand their own activity, their own thought, their own feelings, yet it is they who really create misery and havoc. Self-knowledge is not the knowledge of some supreme self, which is still within the field of the mind, but the knowledge of yourself in your daily action, what you do every day, what you feel, what you think every moment. This requires extraordinary alertness, does it not? There must be constant alertness to pursue every thought, every feeling and to know all their

contents. From self-knowledge comes right thinking, therefore, right action which is really extremely simple when you are aware, but extremely difficult when you talk theoretically about it. Most of us are so callous about everything, about life itself, that we would rather discuss what is self-knowledge than be aware. Yet it is only through right thinking which comes through self-knowledge, the knowledge of everything we do, think and feel, that we can bring order and peace, and not in any other way. No system of philosophy, either of the left or of the right, can bring order, peace and happiness to men because it is you and I who have created this misery, through our everyday stupidity, ill-will and envy. These things cannot be eradicated until we understand them. We can only understand them as they function within us, in you and in me, and not by theoretically reading about them in any book; and through understanding them we will bring virtue into being and virtue gives freedom and that freedom is Truth.

I have many questions to answer. I have chosen seven as representing the many and I am going to try to answer these seven questions as quickly and as concisely as possible.

Question: Can an ignorant man with many responsibilities understand and so carry out your teachings without the aid of another, without resorting to books and to teachers?

Krishnamurti: Now, can understanding be given to another? Can you be taught how to love? Can you go to a guru, a teacher, or read a book and learn how to love, how to be kind, how to be generous and how to understand? Can you follow another and be free? Can you accept authority and yet be creative? Surely creativeness comes only when there is freedom, inward freedom, when there is no fear, when there is no imitation, when there is no submission to authority whether of a sacred book or of a teacher. Now, who is the ignorant man? Surely the ignorant man is the man who does not know himself, and not the man who is not learned: The learned man is really stupid in his ignorance because he relies on knowledge, books, outward authority to give him understanding, but understanding comes only through self-knowledge which is the true state of yourself, the state of your total process and not only one part of your

being, either the material or the psychological, for both these act and react upon each other. The study of yourself, which is self-knowledge, is extraordinarily arduous as it demands constant awareness which is not introspection because introspection is merely the improvement of the self, the self which is functioning every day. Improvement implies condemnation and depression; that is introspection, but awareness is totally different. Awareness can only come into being when you are not condemning, when you are alertly passive. So, self-knowledge is the beginning of wisdom.

Now, the questioner asks: Can an ignorant man, with many responsibilities, understand and carry out your teachings without the aid of a teacher? Obviously, if you accept authority there cannot be understanding, for authority is ever blinding whether it be outward authority or inward authority; and to have many responsibilities implies relationship, does it not? And relationship is a process of self-revelation. Only in relationship can you find out. There is no such thing as living in isolation. Even the man who seeks to avoid the world and run away from the world, is in relationship with others, because to exist is to be related and in the relationship between you and me, between yourself and another, the activities of the self are revealed.

Surely in order to know yourself, to know what you think, what you feel, you don't have to go to a guru. Though it is arduous no one can help you to follow out every thought, every feeling and to realize their implications and their significance. You and I can discuss it, go into it significantly, with complete concentration, with interest; but because you are not really interested, you will go to someone else to find out how to think, how to discover and that is the misfortune. The moment you are interested, the moment you recognize your responsibility in relationship then that very process begins to unwrap the ways of your own thoughts and actions. So, the problem is not whether you should read books or go to teachers but whether, very simply, you are aware of what you are doing, of what you are thinking, when you put on your sacred threads, your namams, when you talk to your servants; aware of the way you treat your wives, your children and your neighbours. Be aware every moment and see what happens. You will see that when you are aware,

the mind, of the memory; you want to begin with the most difficult and far away and not with the near, because it is much easier to be aware of God, for you can lose yourself in an idea, in imagination. But to be aware of your own daily acts, daily feelings, daily thoughts is much more painful and so you would rather be aware of something far away than of the things very close, such as your relationship with your wife or with your neighbour. You can be aware of love ideologically for it is the farthest and the most difficult thing. But to be aware in our relationship, how cruel we are, thoughtless, callous, self-enclosed, is very painful; and being conscious of the immediate pain which direct awareness brings, we would rather think of, or be aware of the universal consciousness, whatever that may mean, which again is a form of escape from the actual, from what is.

So, the awareness I am speaking of, is the awareness of what is, what is actually, directly in front of you, because in understanding what is, which is the very nearest, you can reach great depths, great heights; then there is no deception, then there is no self-illusion, because in the understanding of what is there is transformation. You will find that awareness is not condemnation or identification but a process of understanding of what is. If you condemn, if you identify, you stop thinking, do you not? If you want to understand your child and if you condemn him you don't understand him. Similarly if you have a feeling, which is 'what is', don't condemn it, don't identify it with yourself, don't cling to it but be aware of it; and by becoming aware of it you will find that you can go deeper and deeper into it and therefore discover the whole content of what is.

Awareness of what is, must be choiceless which again is very arduous. Awareness is that state of choicelessness, because if you want to understand something you must not condemn or identify, it must tell you its story. After all, if you observe a child, if you want to understand him, if you want to study him, his ways, his mannerisms, his idiosyncrasies, his moods, you can only do that if you don't condemn him or identify yourself with him, saying: this is my child. Condemnation, justification or identification prevents understanding and to be aware of the whole total process of what is, there must be choiceless observation. You do just that when

you are interested in something, when you are vitally interested in pursuing something, in understanding something, you are not criticising, you are not condemning, you give all your mind and heart to it. But, unfortunately we are trained educationally and religiously to condemn and not to understand. After all, condemnation is very easy, but to understand is very arduous, understanding requires intelligence, condemnation does not demand any intelligence at all, condemnation is a form of self-protection just as identification is. When you condemn you protect yourself, but if you want to understand what is, condemnation is a barrier. If you want to understand the state of the world as it is now, its appalling misery, surely it is no good condemning it, you must investigate it, you must observe from different points of view, from the psychological, economic, and so on. It is a total process and to understand the total process you cannot condemn it in part. We condemn because it is so easy to condemn, while to be aware and to pursue all the implications requires a great deal of patience, a capacity to penetrate and to be still. You understand only when there is stillness, when there is silent observation, passive awareness. Then the problem yields you its significance. So, the awareness of which I am speaking is awareness of what is, and not of something which is the invention of the mind. Being aware implies awareness of the mind's activities in which are included ideas, beliefs but also the tricks which the mind plays upon itself. So, be aware of what is, without condemnation, without justification or identification, then you will see that there is a deeper understanding which resolves our problems.

Question: I am very interested in your teachings; I would like to spread them. What is the best way to do it?

Krishnamurti: Many things are involved in this question. Let us look at it. Propaganda is a lie because mere repetition is not Truth. What you can repeat is a lie. Truth cannot be repeated for Truth can only be experienced directly; mere repetition is a lie because repetition implies imitation. That which you repeat may be Truth to someone but when you repeat it, it ceases to be Truth. Propaganda is one of the terrible things in which we are caught. You know something or you don't know.

Usually you have read something in some books and you have heard some talk and you want to spread it. Have words any significance besides the verbal meaning? So what you are spreading is really words and do words or terms, resolve our problems? Say, for instance, you believe in reincarnation; you don't know why you believe but you want to spread that belief. What are you spreading in fact? Your belief, terms, words, your convictions which are still within the field, within the layer of verbal expression.

We think in words, in terms, we seek explanations which are still only words and we are caught in this monstrous lie, believing that the word is the thing. Surely, the word God is not God, but you believe that the word is God and that therefore you can spread it. Please see this. To you the word has become important, and not Reality. So you are caught in the verbal level and what you want to spread is the word. That means you will catch what I am saying in the net of words and so cause a new division between man and man. Then you will create a new system based on Krishnamurti's words which you the propagandist will spread among other propagandists who are also caught in words and thereby what have you done? Whom have you helped? No, Sirs, that is not the way to spread. So don't try what is stupid, what is the height of folly—to spread someone else's experience.

If you experience something directly, it would be experience not based on belief; because what you believe you experience and therefore it is not real experience but only conditioned experience; there can be experience, the right kind of experience only when thinking ceases, but that experience cannot be spread as information to clear the mess. But, if you begin to understand simple things like nationalism, surely you can discuss it with others, in order to make it known as a poison which is destroying man. Sirs, you are not aware of the enormous calamity that lies in wait for you and for the whole world because this poison is spreading. You are nationalists, you are Hindus against Pakistan, against England, against Germany, against Russia, and so on. So, nationalism is a poison, is it not? You can understand that very easily, because it divides men. You cannot be a nationalist and talk of brotherhood; these terms are contradictory.

That also you can understand, that you can talk about. But you don't want to talk about that because that would mean a change of heart within yourself, which means that you must cease to be a Hindu with your beliefs, ceremonies and all the rubbish that is around you. We don't talk about nationalism because we might be asked if we are free of it ourselves. Not being free, we evade it and try to discuss something else. Surely you can talk about something which you live and which you are doing every day, and that is what I have been talking about—your daily actions, your daily thoughts and feelings. My words you cannot repeat, for, if you do, they will have no meaning; but you can talk about the way you live, the way you act, the way you think, from which alone there can be understanding; all that, you can discuss; but there is no use of groups with Presidents and Secretaries and organizations which are terrible things in which you are often caught. Sirs, though you all smile, yet surely you are all caught in these.

I don't think you know how catastrophic the whole situation is in the world now. I don't have to frighten you. You have merely to pick up a newspaper and read about it. You are on the edge of a precipice and you still perform ceremonies, carry on in your stupid ways, blind to what is happening. You can only alter by transformation of yourself and not by the introduction of a new system whether of the left or of the right. In the transformation of yourself is the only hope but you cannot transform yourself, radically, profoundly, if you are above all a Hindu, if you perform ceremonies, if you are caught in the net of organizations.

As it has always been in the past, so also at the present time the salvation of man is in his being creative. You are caught inwardly in belief, in fear and in those hindrances that prevent the coming together of man and man. That is, if I don't know how to love you, how to love my neighbour, my wife, how can there be communion between us. We need communion, not communion between systems but communion between you and me without systems, without organizations and that means we must really know how to love one another, our hearts must be opened to one another; but your hearts cannot be open if you belong to an organization,

if you are bound by beliefs, if you are nationalistic, if you are a *brahmin* or a *sudra*.

So, you can spread even a tiny part of what I have been talking about, only as you live it. It is by your life that you communicate profoundly, not through words. Words, Sirs, to a serious, thoughtful man have very little meaning. Terms are of very little significance when you are really seeking Truth, Truth in relationship and not an abstract Truth of valuations, of things, or of ideas. If you want to find the truth of those things verbally, it is of little importance; but words become very important when you are not seeking Truth; then the word is the thing and then the thing catches you. So, if you want to spread these teachings, live them, and by your life you will be spreading them, you will be communicating them, which is much more true and significant than verbal repetition, for repetition is imitation and imitation is not creativeness and you as an individual must awake to your own conditioning and thereby free yourself and hence give love to another.

Question: Is marriage necessary for women?

Krishnamurti: I don't know why it is necessary for women any more than it is for men. This is really an enormous problem. We will try to tackle it. First of all we are trying to understand the problem, we are not trying to condemn it or identify with it or justify it. We are trying to understand the problem of marriage, in which is implied, sexual relationship, love, companionship, communion. Obviously if there is no love, marriage becomes a disgrace, does it not? Then it becomes mere gratification. To love is one of the most difficult things, is it not? Love can come into being, can exist only when the self is absent. Without love, relationship is a pain; however gratifying, or however superficial, it leads to boredom, to routine, to habit with all its implications. Then, sexual problems become all important. In considering marriage, whether it is necessary or not, one must first comprehend love. Surely, love is chaste, without love you cannot be chaste; you may be a celibate, whether a man or a woman, but that is not being chaste, that is not being pure, if there is no love. If you have an ideal of what is, if you want to become chaste, there is no

love in it either because it is merely the desire to become something which you think is noble, which you think will help you to find Reality; there is no love there at all. Licentiousness is not chaste, it leads only to degradation, to misery. So does the pursuit of an ideal. Both exclude love, both imply becoming something, indulging in something and therefore you become important and where you are important, love is not.

So, that is one of the problems. Then, if you are not married, consider the difficulties, either for man or woman. Biologically, the woman 'needs' to fulfill herself in a child. When she is deprived of that she is starved, as she is starved when she is deprived of love. And as most women are deprived of love they seek fulfillment in things or in their children. So, children and things become all important to women, whereas the man tries to fulfill himself in work and activity. But is there fulfillment? I hope you are following all this. If I try to fulfill myself through things, through family, through ideas, then family, names, things and ideas become very important. And therefore I give value to things, to relationship, to ideas. I give them a greater value than they have because they are important to me. I introduce wrong laws, wrong methods, wrong values instead of finding out if there is fulfillment.

What do we mean by fulfillment? As long as we are seeking fulfillment there is fear, is there not? I want to fulfill myself in my family, in my name, in my continuity or in things or in ideas. So, there is always a desire for fulfillment where there is frustration. I want to fulfill myself because I am aware that I am not fulfilling myself. The fact is I am not fulfilling. I am empty, I would like to fill that emptiness. So, what happens? I merely pursue fulfillment without understanding 'what is'. If I understood what is, which is my emptiness, my hollowness, my shallowness, my pettiness, then I could transform that. There is a tremendous revolution in that. But, if I merely pursue fulfillment, then there is misery because I seek fulfillment in so many ways, which is merely a continuation of my own emptiness. So, that is one of the problems.

Then there is the problem of creativeness which is not merely the breeding of children. Sirs. a man who is happy .

inwardly, who is creative, does not bother whether he is married or unmarried, he is not seeking fulfillment, he is not escaping through passion, through lust. We cease to be creative when we are imitative, when we are merely functioning according to the response of memory. The response of memory is generally called thinking but such thinking is merely a response of the framework of references which is memory, and that is not real thinking. There is real thinking only when there is no response to memory. In that passive alert awareness, there is creativeness. When you are in that state, then life with all its passions, with all its desires, fades away which does not mean that you cease to love, on the contrary.

Sirs, in order to communicate with another there must be love. It is because we have not that love that all these problems arise; whether I should or should not marry, whom should I marry, the sexual problem, creativeness and so on. But unfortunately, love is something you cannot learn, it is something which cannot be translated. It comes into being when you have no problem. Have you not found yourselves walking along the streets sometimes, looking at the stars, looking at the sky, or the sunset and feeling happy without knowing why? At such times you want to put your arm around another, you are really in communion with man. But unfortunately, we are so occupied with our own thoughts and problems and fears and our envy, that we have no time to be in communion. You don't know your wife, you don't know your husband or your children. You may have children but there is no love, because you and your wife are isolated. You are hiding behind a wall of your own making and without breaking down that wall, there cannot be communion and to commune there must be love. Without love, mere search for chastity, celibacy, is unchaste. When there is love there is chastity, purity, there is incorruptibility.

Question: I have listened to what you have been saying and I feel that to carry out your teachings I must renounce the world I live in.

Krishnamurti: Sir, you cannot renounce the world, can you? What is the world? The world is made up of things, relationships and ideas. How can you give up

things? Even if you give up your house you will still have a 'kurtha'. You may renounce your wife but you will still be in relation with someone, with the milkman, for instance, or the man who gives you food. And you cannot renounce belief, can you? I wish you would. Begin there, if you must renounce something, renounce the wrong valuation which you have given to everything. Wrong valuations create havoc and it is from these wrong valuations which cause misery that you want to escape. You don't want to understand that you are giving wrong values. You want to escape from the result of wrong values but if you understood the world, which is—ideas, relationship, things—and their true significance, then you would not be in conflict with the world. You cannot withdraw from the world, to withdraw means isolation and you cannot live in isolation. You can live in isolation only in an asylum, but not by renouncing the world. You can only live truly happily with the world when you are not of the world, which means you don't give wrong values to the things in the world. This can happen only when you understand yourself the giver of wrong values. Sirs, it is like a stupid man trying to renounce stupidity. He will still be stupid, he may try to become clever but he will remain stupid. But if he understood what stupidity is, that is, himself, surely then he would reach great heights. Then he would have wisdom. It is not by renouncing that you can find Reality. By renouncing you escape into illusion, you do not discover that which is true. So, what I have been saying is that one must give right values to things, to relationship, to ideas and not try to escape from the world. It is comparatively easy to go away into isolation, but it is extremely arduous to be aware and to give true values. Sirs, things have no value in themselves. The house has no value in itself but it has the value you give it. If psychologically you are empty, insufficient in yourself, the house becomes very important because you identify yourself with the house, and then comes the problem of attachment and renunciation. It is really stupid, and if you understood your inward nature, your inward hollowness, then the problem would have very little meaning. Everything becomes extraordinarily significant when you are trying to use it to cover up your own loneliness. Similarly with relationship, with ideas, with

belief. So, there is richness only in understanding the significance of what is, and not in running away into isolation.

Question: a) Life hurls at us one problem after another. Will the state of awareness of which you speak enable us to understand and solve, once and for all, the whole question of problems or have they to be solved one after the other?

Question: b) I feel certain deep urges which need to be disciplined. What is the best way of disciplining them?

Krishnamurti: Sirs, it is a very difficult problem. Those of you who are really earnest must give your mind and heart to it. First of all, there are problems, one after the other. Life is one constant battle of problems and we want to know how to solve them, how to meet them or how to discipline ourselves in order to resist them. That is the whole problem: How are we to discipline ourselves so as not to let problems affect us, how are we to prevent this constant arising of problems? Can they be cut off at the root once and for all?

So, there are several things involved in this question. You will be pursued by problems, one after the other, with their constant annoyance and pain, constant apprehensions if you don't understand who is the creator of problems. If you understand who is the creator of problems, then naturally you will not deal with the problems one by one; that would be utterly stupid. If I understand the cause and not merely the symptoms, then the symptoms cease to be. Similarly if I understand who is the creator of the problems, then the problems cease to be, then there is no question of tackling first one problem and then another.

Then, there is implied the problem of the thinker and the thought, of the one who disciplines and the one who is disciplined. The thinker, the imitator, the discipliner is trying to discipline his thought. This is one of the problems and the other is how to resist attack from the outside. So let us begin with the resistance first.

Do you resist when you understand something? Surely not. Discipline exists only as a measure of resistance; otherwise you don't need discipline at all. If through discipline you can create a certain habit, a certain isolation, a certain

enclosure then you think you will no longer be afraid. So, discipline, which is resistance or a means of self-protection exists when there is no understanding. If you understand a problem, then the problem ceases. You don't have to resist it. For example, if you understand why you are arrogant then you don't have to resist arrogance. Your disciplining yourself is again arrogance, pride, the pride of achieving, the pride of becoming, the pride of being somebody, it is the search for power, position. If you understand all of that then you will never resist, and you will not discipline your mind 'not to be arrogant'. So, to understand 'what is', is extremely difficult because to understand what is, there must be no distraction of an opposite; for instance, of humility which is the opposite of arrogance. There must be complete concentration on 'what is':

So, discipline exists only as a form of resistance. You discipline yourself in order not to be tempted, you discipline yourself against something. But, discipline as a mode of resistance, which is violence, ceases only when you understand it, when you are aware of it, when you don't reject it, when you don't condemn it. You will find that through awareness there comes a discipline which is not imposed, a discipline of extraordinary intelligence and pliability. A man who resists is really 'dead', he is 'enclosed' to a man who is independent and free. So, discipline is resistance, I am using the word to include all modes and practices used for self-protection. Discipline is a form of resistance and where there is resistance, there is enclosure and where there is enclosure there is no understanding, there is no communion. A disciplined man is merely righteous and a righteous man has no love in his heart, he is enclosed within the walls of his becoming.

The other point in this question is whether problems can be solved at all. ~~in one stroke with off at the root.~~ But first we must discover who is the creator of problems. If the creator is understood the problems will cease. The creator of the problem is the thinker, is he not? Problems do not exist apart from the thinker, that is obvious, is it not? The thinker is the creator of the problems whether many or one. Now, is the thinker separate from his thoughts? If he is separate, then the problem will continue because he creates the pro-

blem, separates himself from it and deals with the problem. But if the thinker is the thought, inseparably, then being the creator, he can begin to solve himself without being concerned with the problem, or with the thought. Now, you think that the thinker is separate from his thought, that is exactly what all your religious books, your philosophies are based on. Is that not so? It does not matter what the Bhagavad Gita says or what any book says. Is the thinker separate from his thought? If he is separate, problems will continue, if he is not, then he can be freed of the source of all problems.

If the thinker is separate from his thoughts, how does he become separated? Remove the qualities of the thinker, remove his thoughts, where is the thinker? The thinker is not. Remove the qualities of the self which is memory, ambition and so on, where is the self? But if you say the self is not the thinker but some other entity behind the thinker, he is still the thinker, because you have only pushed the thinker further back. Now, why has the thinker separated himself from his thoughts? The thinker cannot be without thought because if there is no thought there is no thinker. Now the thinker has separated himself from the thought for the simple reason that thought can be transformed, can be modified, and so in order to give himself permanency the thinker separates himself from the thought and thereby gives himself permanency. The thought being transient, mutable, can be altered, but the thinker who creates the thought can be permanent. He is the permanent entity, whereas the thought is changeable, it can be changed according to circumstances, according to environmental influences but he the thinker remains. He is the thought, and if thought ceases he is not, surely, although all our books say differently. Just think it out for yourself for the first time. Put your books aside, forget your authorities and look at the problem directly. Without the thought the thinker is not and the thinker creates the thought and separates himself from it in order to protect himself; thereby he gives stability, certainty to himself and continuity.

Now, how does the thinker come into being? Obviously through desire. Desire is the outcome of perception, contact, sensation, identification and 'me'. Perception of a car, contact,

sensation, desire, identification, and 'I like it', 'I want it'. So, I am the product, the thinker is the product of desire, and having produced the 'I', the 'I' separates itself from the thought because it can then transform the thought and yet remain permanent.

So, as long as the thinker is separate from his thought, there will be problems, one after the other, innumerable problems; but if there is no separation, if the thinker is the thought, then what happens? Then the thinker himself undergoes a transformation, a radical, fundamental transformation, and that, as I have said, is meditation. It is self-knowledge, it is all that I have said about the thinker; how he separates himself from the thought and how the thinker has come into being. You can test it for yourself. You don't have to read a sacred book to find out the truth of it. That is the beginning of self-knowledge and from that there comes meditation. Meditation is the ending of thought of the thinker, by not giving significance to the thinker, by not giving continuity to the thinker. The thinker is disciplining his thought, separating himself so as to give continuity to himself through property, through family, through ideas. and as long as the thinker exists there will be problems and it is when the thinker ceases thinking, that meditation begins. Meditation is self-knowledge and without self-knowledge there is no meditation. You will find that if you go into the whole question of self-knowledge which is the beginning of wisdom—not by any practice because practice is merely resistance—you can go deeper and deeper starting with the centre which is the desire creating the 'I', the self; and when that self continues in the Atman or higher self it is still the thinker merely pushing further back his permanency. Till you are aware of this whole process there is no ending of the problem. But when you become aware, you will find that time has ceased—time as memory of the past and the future—and that there is the immediate present, the eternal, and in this alone is Reality.

December 28, 1947

*Notes of Group-discussions
at Madras during 1947 with.*

J. KRISHNAMURTI

MADRAS 1947

*Notes of Group-discussions
at Madras during 1947 with*

J. KRISHNAMURTI

MADRAS 1947

FOREWORD

During Krishnamurti's stay in Madras, several persons interested in his teachings met him regularly on alternate days for nearly 2½ months up to the end of December 1947 and discussed with him various economic, social and religious problems including the problem of relationship between one another, which vitally affect them in their daily life, with a view to understanding those problems and discovering what they were seeking in life.

These notes were prepared by me then and there at the conclusion of each meeting, for publication in a Madras Weekly; they are now published in book-form.

These notes are not authentic and they have not been read or revised by Krishnamurti. However, it is hoped that they will be a great help to the readers in understanding Krishnamurti's teachings on Life, Reality and Liberation.

Madras
July 1948

R. MADHAVACHARI

24th October, 1947.

Before we begin to discuss, I would like to say something about the discussion and its purpose. First of all, it is not a club for disputation and argumentation.

In Europe and in America, we had groups of different types of people and we went into things that we thought were very important; we continued such clubs for a couple of months or even sometime longer. At the end of it, some did understand. Similarly, I hope that during these months or weeks of discussion we will get somewhere.

I feel that each one of us must discover or prepare the field so that Reality comes into being; because, Reality is the only solution of our problems whether economic, social, religious, or of relationship between ourselves. Without the realization of that, I do not see how any problem in the world can be solved. My intention in holding these discussions is to help each other to realize it. It is going to be very arduous because it requires real revolution in thinking, in all the phases of our life. I feel that it is a matter of life and death. Therefore, before we begin to discuss, we must know our various intentions, that is, the relationship between yourself and myself. I may want to go north and you may want to go south; we may eventually meet because south and north do meet as the earth is round.

We are going to discover what our intentions are during these discussions. So, please bear in mind the importance of relationship between ourselves so that we may both go to the same direction not compulsorily but naturally, spontaneously.

Before we begin to discuss anything, we ought to know our intention, what it is that we want, or what it is that we are unconsciously, deeply, seeking. If we can find that, our problems become comparatively simple.

Another point in discussion is that I will use words which have meaning to me but not to you. I am using words very carefully because they have a meaning to me, and I use very

simple and straight language which I am willing to explain carefully. I do not know if you have ever thought about this. Words have the verbal meaning as well as the nervous response. Take, for example, the word God. It has a verbal as well as a nervous response.

These discussions should not deteriorate into mere argumentation, nor should we indulge in verbal expression. We want to discuss together so that we can see something which is beyond words, beyond emotional, sentimental or intellectual froth. And that can only be done if each one of us is willing to expose himself.

These discussions should give an opportunity to understand ourselves. As it is not questioning and answering, do not put questions and wait for my answer. We travel together on a journey. I may perhaps know a little more than you do. You are also travelling on that road. You do not have to sit on the roadside and know little of the journey. We are making the same journey and discovering together. It is like unfolding a map and seeing the various places and proceeding on the right path. Then, this is a mutual discovery. If we are willing to undertake the journey together, it will be a process of self-discovery and self-understanding, from which we begin to think rightly and, therefore, act rightly.

We have many problems—economic, social, religious and of relationship between one another. The reality of each problem is its own solution. The purpose of our discussions is to discover, or to prepare the field, so that Reality comes into being.

Words have a verbal meaning as well as a nervous response and their full significance has to be understood. There has to be self-discovery. Self-understanding alone leads to right thinking and right acting. In discussing, we should become aware of our own ways of thinking. It would then be possible to bring about almost instantaneous perception of truth and to change ourselves radically, fundamentally, and immediately.

What are the chief obstacles in the way of understanding? We see things with a bias, at an angle, with a prejudice, with a desire to escape from the problem; there are also subconscious blockages. Our problems are not static but ever-changing; to understand them, we should be as alert as the problems. Therefore, any intellectual, verbal or authoritarian, positive or negative conclusion—which is a picture of the past—is a hindrance to understanding, so also is a hypothesis, working or otherwise. For example, you cannot understand your son if you first discuss with professors and experts, form conclusions, and then look at your son in the light of such conclusions.

To understand a living problem, one should be alert and watchful and must follow the movement of life as quickly and correctly as possible. If you have a ready-made conclusion or *hypothesis*, it means that you have not understood life. A conclusion is an impediment as it only remains on the verbal level; but if you see the truth of a matter or if you discover a fact by your own thinking, it is not a conclusion.

There are in the world as it exists to-day, two categories of people, each category with its own way of thinking based on study and experimentation. Both have formed systems of their own, upon which they are working. Ideologically, tremendous efforts are being made to bring you under one or the other of these two :—

(i) Matter is in movement and therefore creates the idea. Man is only the product of environment and can therefore be compelled or shaped to any form of action. Therefore, any means is justified if it achieves the end in view, and

(ii) It is the idea which moves upon matter and controls it. The means and the end will both be of the same kind, i.e., wrong means will mean wrong end and right means right end.

Both these are conclusions and they are therefore bound to retard thinking.

Any conclusion or hypothesis—Individualism or Collectivism, Capitalism or Socialism or Communism, Reincarnation, etc.—is a belief. By accepting a belief, you exclude all other forms of thinking. Belief in God does not mean understanding God. A mind tethered to a belief, hypothesis or conclusion—whether based on its own experience or the experience of others—cannot go far ; it is not free but conditioned. Therefore, belief is a hindrance to understanding.

When the mind seeks safety, security—i.e. something concrete on which it can anchor—it has recourse to a conclusion or to a hypothesis. Experimentation does not lead to conclusion ; the experimenter keeps on watching, looking and observing. To understand what is taking place in the experiment, he is in a receptive mood, quiet and sensitive like a photographic plate, without criticising or condemning. So also should be our attitude if we would understand the full significance of a marvellous scene, a picture, or a poem.

Relationship is a living thing and as a living thing it is self-revealing. Yet, as we base it on our beliefs and conclusions, it ceases to be 'living' and becomes a problem. You cannot have vested interests—economic, psychological or spiritual—and at the same time freedom.

Awareness of our 'conditioning' or 'blockages' will lead to a sea of troubles. "My son, if you come to serve God, come prepared for temptation". Those who are pursuing Truth will have to meet troubles; it is they who are going to change the world.

28—10—1947

We discovered that any form of conclusion, right or wrong, immediate or ultimate, now or final, or any form of working hypothesis consciously or unconsciously held, is detrimental to full comprehension or understanding of the whole process of existence. Hindrances are not overcome or broken; but, when the mind becomes aware of the hindrances, those hindrances cease to be.

What is awareness? There is objective awareness. Then, there is the emotional response to each other or to truth. Then, there is awareness of ideas, of thinking, conscious or unconscious. It is a widening and deepening grasp of both the conscious and the unconscious. It is a clear recognition of what is, not what should be or what, ideologically, should take place. To be aware implies to recognize and to know fully and clearly how the "I" is moving, living and functioning—physically, psychologically, consciously or unconsciously.

Experience and experiencer, thinker and his thoughts, are the same. For example, at the moment of anger, the person who feels angry and his quality of anger are the same. Just afterwards the thinker separates himself from the quality and condemns the quality if unpleasant or identifies himself with the quality if pleasant. This is because the thinker seeks stability or permanency. When this is understood by the mind, this duality is dissolved.

30—10—1947

It is a realisable fact that one can change radically, fundamentally and immediately. Mere postponement or lengthen-

ing of time is not going to bring about a change. It is possible to bring about almost instantaneous perception of what is Truth and Truth is the liberating factor.

To start with, we should be aware of our words, our gestures and our thoughts. The sense of struggle and of not being able to do something creates frustration because there is in your mind an idea of achievement. This means you did not pursue awareness but just stopped there. When there is an idea, let not the mind just stop there, but let it pursue it till the full implications of that idea are understood. For instance, consider nationalism; when you are entrenched in a conclusion called Nationalism, you cannot understand the German or the English. Though we agree with this verbally, we yet continue as before, because our mind is conditioned, i.e., put in a mould socially, economically, and religiously, and it says that we are different from somebody else. Again, we have the desire to identify ourselves with something greater and which is gratifying. On account of a feeling of emptiness, which we dislike, we identify ourselves with a caste or a class, nation, creed, or idea which affords security—prestige and position—to us. To dissolve this nationalism in us, we must be aware of the fact that we are national and also that nationalism is detrimental to us. In daily life, most of us do not act up to our intellectual convictions because of our fear to displease others, to lose a position, etc.; they are therefore hypocrites to their relatives and later on to the people at large also. Most of us merely follow an old routine of habitual action and thinking.

1-11-1947

A mind which is trained in a pattern, i.e., specially moulded, conditioned, controlled, either in a creed or in a formula or in an idea, can never know itself. Any suppression of control, whether right or wrong, is based on a pattern of control; the mind, being thus controlled, is not free. The mind discovers itself only when it is free of control and attains a certain spontaneity. Discovery of truth liberates and transforms ourselves with joy, clarity and

For example, to find the truth about the need for discipline or otherwise, we must investigate the matter. Some say that if you do not discipline yourself, there will be confusion. Is there not confusion even though you are disciplined? When you have only directed your attention on a particular thing excluding everything else, you still continue to be confused all round. Discipline means education in a certain pattern, i.e., training the mind positively or negatively to a desired pattern, in order to produce a certain result. A disciplined mind is conditioned and therefore static, and a static mind cannot understand the living problem of life. Similarly, practice cannot lead to understanding. The implications of practice are to repeat over and over again, something like discipline. You cannot concentrate your faculties through any method or through any practice. When you practise, you become automatic and thoughtless; an automatic habit cannot lead to awareness.

Life's problems are dynamic and living; therefore, to understand them, you must have a mind which is also dynamic and not disciplined. Again, Truth can only come to you, you cannot go to it. It is only when you can go to it that you can discipline yourself to reach it; you can only move from the known to the known and not to the unknown. If the means is 'discipline', the end is bound to be 'disciplined'. Therefore, discipline cannot lead you to freedom. No effort or practice can lead you to understanding. Similarly, freedom is not a gradual process. Understanding cannot be through any process or through gradation which means the employment of time. Time can only produce time, not the timeless. Discipline is mere time and so it cannot lead to the Unknown, the Timeless. When conditioned by a discipline, the mind is insensitive to its problems.

4-11-1947

To recognize exactly, to become aware of 'what is' is terribly difficult for most of us. There can be understanding only when there is an effortless awareness which happens to very one of us at moments of real thinking.

You want security because you do not know what you are. You are not willing to face what you are. Fundamentally you are uncertain, insecure; therefore, you seek security. Seeking security is an indication that you do not know what you are. If you see and know what you are, perhaps you can bring order. If you are confused, you will only act in a confused manner.

8-11-1947

Awareness is not of anything abstract or being aware of Reality, God, or Truth; we must be aware of what we are doing, what we are thinking and feeling. Have you ever watched your mind? One thought precipitates on another before the original one is complete. All these thoughts relate either to the past memories or to the hopes of the future. The mind wanders, ceaselessly and restlessly, back to the past or forward to the future. In longing to find out what it is which we are thinking, we find that most of us are merely accepting, not thinking, and automatically responding according to our particular profession or reacting to a particular conditioning.

The world problem is your problem. To understand the world, you must understand yourself. To transform the world, you must regenerate yourself. You cannot change yourself until there is self-knowledge. The mind finds it difficult to know itself because it is full of conclusions and suppositions and because it is disciplined; without understanding the ways of itself, the mind cannot proceed further. The mind has to be aware of its own activities and its own conditioning before it can be free, and understanding can come only when the mind is free.

How can the mind which is restless and going swiftly backwards and forwards, be aware of its activities? Finding itself restless, the mind, without becoming aware of the causes of this restlessness, quickly directs itself along certain channels, chosen patterns, based on gratification; for a split second it remains so, but moves off again. The mind is very active and extraordinarily complex; there are the conscious layer and the innumerable unconscious layers. To understand any-

thing, there must be observation. An object in swift movement can be watched only when the movement is slowed down. The problem therefore is how to slow down the movement of the mind. Without understanding the problem in all its implications, the mind jumps to meet the problem with ready-made answers like the following :—

(i) Stopping the activity of the mind by force. Then, the mind is 'dead' and not living. Our observation of the 'dead' mind will not help us to understand the mind in movement.

(ii) Disciplining, controlling the mind—then, all your energy is taken up with controlling or disciplining, and you do not understand the mind in movement. Discipline implies conformity, practice, habit which deadens the mind.

(iii) Inviting a higher entity or an outside interference—Paramatman, some entity beyond the mind—to come and study the mind. This does not work because it is still the product of the mind and therefore the result of the known. It is only a trick of the mind.

(iv) Repetition of particular activities of the mind to enable the mind to watch and understand such activities. Repetition makes the mind automatic, thoughtless and therefore not alert but dull. This does not therefore lead to the understanding of the mind in movement.

(v) Various points of view—Each point of view is a preconceived path and is conditioned. The problem will then be translated in terms of that particular point of view only. Therefore, it does not lead to the understanding of the whole.

When any one of the above methods of approach to this problem is taken up by the mind and pursued to its completion, it is found that it does not lead to the solution of the problem and that each such approach is false. Therefore, the method of approach is more important. Without understanding the problem, the mind rushed off with a prepared answer and, after following it through, realised that it was no answer to the problem. The mind must pursue each thought that arises in it, right through till it is complete—just like following up a stream along its course right up to its source; in that very process, the restless mind is slowed down, it becomes extraordinarily quiet and receptive, and understanding comes

Environment is the past in conflict, in modification, or in conjunction with the present. To understand the present, some psychologists have asserted that we must go to the past; but to understand the past, you must begin with the present and observe the same without condemnation.

Understanding a problem undoes the problem directly and resolves it instantaneously without any postponement. For instance, if I feel that I am responsible for the marriage of my daughter, I can resolve that problem of marriage only when I understand all the implications in it. Understanding is a total responsibility of your entire being, a perception which comes to you of the entire picture and not of a part only.

Understanding cannot come through 'Will'. Will involves desire to achieve a result. In this is implied a practice, a continuity—i.e., a continued exercise, practice or discipline—to strengthen your will to become something. It is an accumulated memory which says that I must discipline myself to achieve or gain something; and accumulated memory is the multiplication of desires. Understanding is spontaneous. The grandeur of a marvellous scene impinges on your mind, and there is an immediate response without any exertion or desire on your part to look at it and enjoy it. When a mind is used in compulsory attitudes and actions, it gets worn out at the end of a few years; it is made dull. When the mind is dull, it is unwilling to look at 'what is' but wants to change itself into something else, thus bringing another element into the problem.

We do not see things as they are either through fear or through a desire for security, or through expectation; because, if we see, we have to break them up; because immediate action implies danger to us, disturbs us and troubles us. When we are without love, we do not say "We are without love,"—which is a fact and may perhaps lead us far when realised—but we say "We must be more kind" or "we must love," which is only a hope. *When you feel sorrow you try to explain it away, to comfort yourself by going to the guru or by reading some scriptures.* Similarly, joy comes to us unexpectedly; at the moment of joy we have done nothing; immediately when you have felt joy or when the joy is past, you wish to recapture it and it soon goes away. To recognize that you are without love, without sensitivity, demands extreme alertness.

The recognition of 'what is'—i.e., to accept and see what you actually are—is in itself a transformation.

6-11-1947

Understanding comes with freedom. It is not the result of any desire or will or exertion or accumulated memory, practice or discipline. Therefore, it involves change of will altogether and not merely change in will. Thought which seeks security cannot be transformed by compulsion, and understanding comes voluntarily.

There is chaos and moral degradation in the world, in society, in our environment because, without understanding, we have directed our will and our activities in a certain direction, seeking, though without success, security in things made either by the hand or by the mind. The world—i.e., ourselves—being in chaos, our values are all broken up and destroyed. How is this chaos to be resolved? The present-day world's tendency is to bring about order, if possible, by reorganizing the two values, *property and division of peoples*—i.e., ownership, capitalism, socialism, communism, nationality, religious divisions and caste distinctions between man and man—without reference to the deeper significance of life. We cling to these two values and give them disproportionate value because, for us, there is not a greater value. Throughout the world, these two values have created extraordinary misery; you are not aware that these have caused misery and conflict, because you are thinking of yourself as somebody else. You do not look at the intrinsic significance of these values, and yet attempt to reorganize them.

Through greed, through fear, through desire for security, you create the society, the state which organizes these two values. Property and the divisions between man and man are based on the desire to be secure. Therefore, the difficulty is not in the property but in the desire to be secure. We are thinking of security always and have been moving from one to another which is considered to give us greater security. Thus, the whole process of our thinking is based on security.

thing, there must be observation. An object in swift movement can be watched only when the movement is slowed down. The problem therefore is how to slow down the movement of the mind. Without understanding the problem in all its implications, the mind jumps to meet the problem with ready-made answers like the following:—

(i) Stopping the activity of the mind by force. Then, the mind is 'dead' and not living. Our observation of the 'dead' mind will not help us to understand the mind in movement.

(ii) Disciplining, controlling the mind—then, all your energy is taken up with controlling or disciplining, and you do not understand the mind in movement. Discipline implies conformity, practice, habit which deadens the mind.

(iii) Inviting a higher entity or an outside interference—Paramatman, some entity beyond the mind—to come and study the mind. This does not work because it is still the product of the mind and therefore the result of the known. It is only a trick of the mind.

(iv) Repetition of particular activities of the mind to enable the mind to watch and understand such activities. Repetition makes the mind automatic, thoughtless and therefore not alert but dull. This does not therefore lead to the understanding of the mind in movement.

(v) Various points of view—Each point of view is a preconceived path and is conditioned. The problem will then be translated in terms of that particular point of view only. Therefore, it does not lead to the understanding of the whole.

When any one of the above methods of approach to this problem is taken up by the mind and pursued to its completion, it is found that it does not lead to the solution of the problem and that each such approach is false. Therefore, the method of approach is more important. Without understanding the problem, the mind rushed off with a prepared answer and, after following it through, realised that it was no answer to the problem. The mind must pursue each thought that arises in it, right through till it is complete—just like following up a stream along its course right up to its source; in that very process, the restless mind is slowed down, it becomes extraordinarily quiet and receptive, and understanding comes

For example, you are listening attentively to me when I describe something which is true because I have experienced it. While listening, your mind has slowed down and remained quiet and receptive.

10-11-1947

To bring about order in this confused world, there must be right thinking which will lead to right action. There can be right thinking only when we are aware of the process of our thinking, i.e., when we know what we are thinking, the way we are feeling, etc. We all know how our mind is constantly vagrant and restless and how it is difficult for it to complete any particular thought and follow it out fully, because another thought precipitates itself upon the one which we want to think out. The mind can be understood only when it is slowed down so that each thought, as it arises, can be followed out with care and deep understanding, without effort, without compulsion, without interference and with a sense of freedom; the mind has to dedicate itself to that understanding.

When discussing this problem of slowing down the mind, one suggestion or response after another was made by the mind as to how the mind can be slowed down—i.e., (i) Stopping the mind; (ii) Controlling or disciplining the mind; (iii) Invoking a higher self or an entity beyond the mind; (iv) Repeating a thought to understand it; (v) Considering it each in his own way, i.e., from his own point of view. By analysing each one of these suggestions carefully step by step to its completion, we found these do not lead to the slowing down of the mind in movement, but to the dulling of the mind. In order to slow down the mind to understand it, the approach is not how to slow it down, but to become aware of its restlessness. We see that, in the very process of following carefully each suggestion or response up to its completion, the mind has already slowed down.

The approach is therefore much more important than the problem. It must not be through a particular spoke, from a particular point of view, from a combination of a few points of view, or through any particular channel. Through a part, the whole cannot be understood; and organized society and organized religion are only parts.

Understanding leads to right action. Being afraid to act, most of us say that, eventually, we shall find Truth. But, we will never see, if we do not see it now. If we do not love now, will we love to-morrow ?

13-11-1917

Without self-knowledge, order and peace cannot be brought about within oneself and so outside, i.e., in the world. We considered some of the hindrances to that understanding. When we are up against a hindrance, we immediately think of ways and means to overcome or conquer that hindrance ; but overcoming leads us nowhere as we shall have to keep on overcoming or conquering an enemy—politically, economically or religiously, because the hindrance repeats itself. *You cannot overcome a hindrance ; the hindrance has to be understood by approaching it without condemnation, without judging, without a desire to alter it.* Unfortunately, most of us either condemn or pursue it. So long as there is this condemnatory and identifying attitude, the hindrance is not understood.

We saw that the mind has to slow itself down if its restlessness and vagrancy are to be understood. The quietening of the mind was regarded as a problem outside ; in following it out, we saw that, in becoming aware of the problem and following each of its responses completely, the mind had become quiet and alert, as the mind had to be quiet to think out each response fully.

Thus, the problem is 'you' and not outside you. It is a trick of the mind to pose the problem as though it was taken from outside. Therefore, the approach is very important. To understand Truth, the mind has first to free itself from the framework of organized society or religion. Most of us agree to this verbally ; but, we do not abandon such framework because of the fear that, by freeing ourselves, we are going to create extraordinary disturbances in our daily life.

Understanding leads to right action and to an urge to speak of that understanding. A truth, probably heard by you, ceases to be a truth when you merely repeat it ; it will be a truth to you only when you, for yourself, have discovered it

to be true. Propaganda is mere repetition of another's truth; it ceases to be propaganda when you yourself have discovered the truth.

As fear is one of the chief impediments to right action, it has to be understood. In trying to understand fear—whether physical or psychological—we shall be making a wrong approach if we discuss fear as a problem outside us.

Physical fear :—Physical body is alert and the instinct of self-preservation makes the body act even without any conscious effort of the person who experiences fear—e.g., nearness to a snake.

Psychological fears :—Fear of losing (i) things (ii) relationship, i.e., people connected to us and (iii) ideas—i.e., beliefs etc.

At the moment of fear, the person who experiences fear and the quality of fear are one, i.e., a joint phenomenon. Immediately afterwards, there is a separation and you say that you do not like it and that you must do something about it. The moment of fear is unexpected and you meet it unprepared; and at that moment, there is only a state which contains no quality, a state of most heightened sensitivity. As it is physically impossible to continue in that state without collapse or without getting mad, the instinct of self-protection leads to the separation of the thinker and the quality; if pleasant, the thinker identifies himself with it; if unpleasant, the thinker condemns the quality and sets about to do something about it. In the case of fear, the thinker wants to get rid of it by developing courage, going to a temple or guru, etc., etc., thus developing a whole philosophy; yet, the fear continues to lurk inside all the time. Therefore, the correct approach to the problem is not how to get rid of fear but to realise that there will be fear as long as we are protecting ourselves with property, relationship, name, ideas, beliefs, etc. If we let go any of these, we are nothing; therefore, we are the property, the idea, etc. Thus, frightened of being nothing, we hold on to property, etc., and thereby create a lot of misery in the world. If we tackle our desire for self-protection, then, there will be a transformation, and property etc. will have altogether a different significance.

Life is a continuous challenge and response. Whenever there is a challenge there is a direct response which almost immediately becomes a conditioned response—fear, love, jealousy or something else. At the moment of direct response which is unconditioned, there is only an unprepared state of heightened sensitivity, a state of extreme and intense alertness, without any qualification whatsoever; in that state, there is no dissociation between the person who experiences and the quality which is experienced. As it is extremely difficult to live for any length of time in that state of heightened sensitivity, the conditioned mind which is seeking self-protection, gives it a qualification according to whether pleasure or pain is apprehended; and instantaneously there is a separation of the experiencer from the quality. This leads to a conditioned response.

For instance, when pain is apprehended, the mind gives that state the qualification of fear and, instantaneously, the person who is in a state of fear has separated himself from the quality of fear. Then the person makes a conditioned response to the challenge made by the quality, fear—the conditioned response being “how to overcome fear” or “how to run away from fear”. The conditioned mind can never be free of fear by “overcoming it” by compulsion or discipline, because any such overcoming will necessarily repeat itself. Nor can the mind be free by running away from fear. If we examine closely, we shall see how our whole education, culture, and philosophy are based on running away from conditioned responses like fear. Every attempt to run away from fear fails and the mind is continually engaged in going from one escape to another—only to find ultimately that every such attempt is futile.

When pleasure is apprehended, the experiencer identifies himself with the quality of joy, etc., and goaded by the memory of what he experienced, seeks to have a similar experience again. Another experience of a similar nature only strengthens the memory and therefore strengthens the desire for the experience again. Then, with a view to having absolute security, the conditioned mind projects the idea of God and seeks God. A conditioned mind can only think of the known

and not of the unknown. Therefore, the conditioned mind can never find Reality, God.

We are now trying to understand fear. We know how fear distorts and makes the mind small and also poisons the system. The little-minded people are afraid and they cannot understand the supreme. We have seen how futile is the attempt made by the mind either to overcome fear or to run away from fear. We have also seen how fear is primarily based on the mind's desire for self-protection. Naturally, our problem of fear has not been solved so far because we gave importance to and pursued fear which is only a secondary value, instead of giving importance to and pursuing 'the desire for self-protection' which is the primary value. We are in confusion because we give importance to the symptom and not to the cause, to the secondary values and not to the primary.

As fear is a conditioned response, our concern should be not to condemn it or to justify it but to be aware of it as and when it arises and not run away from it. When we are thus aware of fear and of the process of 'the desire for self-protection', fear ceases and the mind is free of fear.

In understanding fear, one opens the door to the extraordinary meaning of Death which is the Unknown as God is the Unknown. If we do not understand death, we cannot love.

18-11-1947

Before we continue the discussion about fear, death and love, we should discuss quite an important subject—the art of listening. Life is really both a challenge and a response, and if we do not know how to respond truly, there will be misery. Similarly, if we do not know how to listen, our mind is so filled with our own thoughts, our own problems, our own conclusions and our own questions, that it is almost impossible to listen to somebody. Is it not possible to listen with an extraordinary alertness, but not with an effort? After all, understanding comes, not through effort but spontaneously when there is an effortless relaxation, a sense of

communication with each other. When you love somebody very deeply and really, in that state of real affection, there is a sense of full communication. We do not have to make an effort or to exert ourselves. I think it is important during these discussions to listen with ease but yet with a tension because most of us, when we are at ease, are generally lazy, so relaxed that nothing can penetrate. But, there is a right tension, a psychological tension, not a tension to the breaking point; but, as the string of a violin, it must be tuned just right. Similarly, it is possible for us to listen in such a way that communication is possible instantaneously, at the same time and the same level.

In understanding fear we found that the desire to protect oneself projects the quality of fear, and that merely dealing with the symptom and not with the cause is utterly futile. So, the question of overcoming fear never arises to a thoughtful person, as it is only dealing with symptoms and not with the maker of symptoms. A conditioned response is like a wave in a lake when a stone is thrown, and we pursue and try to solve that wave which is a conditioned response. We came to the point of studying what Death means. We said that as reality is unknown, so Death is also unknown. We have spent centuries in studying Reality, but we have hardly spent five minutes in studying Death. We have avoided Death as something abominable, something at which we are frightened and we have tried to overcome it by beliefs and ideations of morality. But we have never understood the significance of Death.

Response and challenge are not different things. They are only separate when the response is conditioned. Our response to a challenge is according to our environmental influence—Brahmin, Non-brahmin, writer, poet, etc. There is always the distance of time between challenge and response; and when such responses cease, there is death. Let us experiment and be aware of the significance of death on all the different planes of consciousness. We have seen the effects of death on a body, to a bird, to a leaf, wearing out of the physical organism. But that is not death, that is only a part of awareness of death. In life, everything seems to end in death; all our activities, our civilization, wars, conflict with each other, our physical existence, emotional responses, ideation and

thoughts, all come to an end. Seeing that all that is known to it comes to an end, the mind apprehends itself coming to an end and, as it does not like to die, seeks permanency by anchoring itself to something unknown which it considers to be secure; if it is not anchored to something which it knows to be secure, it ceases to function. Thought is the result of the past, the known, the accumulation of what it has read, what it has been told, social environment, religious background, and what it has been conditioned to. As long as the mind is the known, it translates the unknown or any new experience that comes, in the light of the known. When we meet a stranger, we view him with all our prejudices and conditioned responses. In the unknown, there is no security because we do not know it at all. Therefore, the mind is afraid of the unknown; therefore it must project itself into the unknown and seek security there. So it must have a belief in the unknown, in Reincarnation, in God, or in an idea, and so on especially as the mind is afraid of coming to an end. Therefore our thoughts are always proceeding from the known to the known, from memory to memory. A memory is the residue, left in the mind, of an experience. The moment the mind is uncertain, it becomes anxious, and therefore it must have the known all the time. If the mind is moving from the known to the known, it cannot possibly know the unknown; and therefore we are unaware of the significance of Death. We are afraid even to talk about it, and so we put it away and think about God. We deny Death and hold on to God though we do not know what God is. Beauty is not the denial of the ugly. We cannot understand the pleasant by denying the unpleasant. We do not know what the ugly and the unpleasant mean, yet we have condemned them. We do not know what God is, yet we accept God.

Suicide is a part of death. A person who is committing suicide puts an end to his life when he is faced with a problem which he cannot solve, when his thoughts and feelings have come to a point when they cannot see into the future and cannot proceed further. When one is happy he has no problem and he does not wish to end that.

You ask whether hate is not a manifestation of death. Hate is a conditioned response, Death is also a conditioned

response to something which we do not know. Hate does not exist by itself.

Our mind is ever seeking continuance through various means. To us, God is the ultimate continuance and Death the ultimate denial of continuance.

Because thought is the result of the past, it can only think in terms of time, to-day, yesterday and to-morrow, in terms of the known; and the known it wants to continue. If that continuance is denied, it will commit suicide. It is only concerned with moving from the known to the known. When it proceeds to God, it is only projecting itself into the unknown and seeking security there in God; therefore, that projection, God, is still the known though the mind has invested in God as the ultimate guarantee of its continuance. As long as the mind is moving from the known to the known, it is 'dead', and a 'dead' thing cannot understand anything. When the mind realises that it is 'dead', there will be life. We can discover something amazing when we realise that we are 'dead' and are alive only verbally.

20—11—1947

These discussions are a process of self-exploration and self-examination, and not self-introspection which is quite different from awareness. It is as though we are watching a mirror in front of us, which is not distorting our thoughts and our feelings and actions, but is showing exactly 'what is' and not what we would like them to be.

When we discussed about fear we found that fear was only secondary but what was really significant was self-protection in all its extraordinary and subtle ways on different levels *and different states of consciousness, which gave rise to fear.* In understanding the process of self-protection which is primary, fear which is secondary, loses its significance.

In discussing death, we found that, realising that everything comes to an end—relationship, things and ideas, not only physiological but psychological also—we are afraid of death, we are desirous of proceeding from the known to the known,

to give us continuity, and this continuity we call immortality. When that continuity comes to an end, we call that death. We do not know Death just as we do not know Reality. We have divided life into living and death and we have shunned death and clung on to what appeared to give us security. I think it is important that we should understand the whole question of death because, in that, there is renewal. That which ends has always a beginning. That which continues without an end has no renewal.

As thought moves from the known to the known, there is no ending of thought; therefore, there is no renewal; and it is only in death there is renewal. A society can be renewed only when it throws off the old. But you cannot have the old and the new together and that leads to destruction. It is one of the tricks of the mind that, being confronted with uncertainty, it seeks security elsewhere in property, family, ideas and beliefs and so on. As one cannot think of the unknown, one can only think of the known, the outcome of the thought which is the result of the past. Thought abominates coming to an end, that is, to be uncertain of anything, and it wants continuance.

Ordinarily, in the physical sense, we desire to continue through property, through our job and through our routine. Psychologically, we continue through our memory. All our systems are based on continuity. We seek continuity in property, name, and identifying ourselves with something. When we find that there is no continuity or permanency in objects we turn to psychological factors, such as beliefs and ideas and so on. The thought, being afraid of discontinuity, thinks in terms of the continuity of the soul. Continuity implied through a belief or through the soul is the product of thought and therefore it is the result of the known, because thought can only think of something which it knows. So thought is really concerned with continuity and not with Truth or God. Continuity is a time-process and there cannot be a renewal in the time-process.

Memory is the residue left in the mind of insufficient experience; and when an experience is complete there is no memory.

Some say that the mind is the instrument of the spirit. But, the spirit is also the process of the mind. The moment

we say there is spirit, it is a process of thought. There is perception, sensation, contact, desire and identification, all processes of challenge and response. In other words, we have exercised thought which is the product of the mind. Even while we are sleeping, the unconscious is working, which gives hints to thoughts. When we are thinking about something beyond, it is also the process of the mind and therefore it is unreal.

To say that God is 'me' is incorrect as God or Truth cannot exist in contradiction, because we are in ourselves having the evil and the good, which is a contradictory state. Complete paralysis is death and incomplete paralysis is life. We come across several people who are both physiologically and psychologically half dead, yet they function. If God is in us, we need not purify ourselves or renew ourselves.

Every experience is leaving a residue and we call it memory. When we meet an experience anew, it will not leave any residue; that occurs when we meet the experience direct without a screen. When new wine is put in the old bottle it breaks. When we are thinking about death, we are not looking at facts, but are translating it to suit our conditioning. Because we are not looking direct at facts but through a screen or a condition or a belief, we are not finding the truth of it. When we do that, we are only strengthening our conditioning and the walls of our conditioning are growing thicker and thicker. As memory is of the known, when we are facing the unknown, we withdraw and translate it in terms of the known. We think we can thereby have continuance. We cannot understand either Death or Reality through memory. There is no renewal through continuance. Because we are caught up in the walls of memory, whether the memory is of the leftist or the rightist, religious or the non-religious, we are dead. Only when the walls break there is going to be renewal. A society that is merely transforming itself within the walls, cannot produce culture. In order to bring about a renewal we must die; and that means we must start anew, putting away completely all memories of the past.

We have been discussing the question of death and fear and we said that any form of continuity is death because continuity implies a constant movement of thought in the fortress of the known. Thought is always moving from the known to the known, from memory to memory, from continuity to continuity, and it cannot think of the unknown. It can verbally picture the unknown or speculate on it, but that picture is not the unknown.

Because the mind is moving in the field of the known, it gives continuity to it through the family, through property, through responsibility, through the machine of routine, through ideation and through belief.

Memory is merely the residue of experience. We experience through the screen of the past and therefore there is no experience at all but only a modification of experience. If we have a certain belief, that belief not only creates that experience, but also translates that experience according to its conditioning. So there is never an experience which is free from conditioning.

When the continuity through the family, through the name, through relationship, etc. is threatened, there is fear; and the ultimate threat to continuity is death. There is no renewal or rebirth in that state; a renewal can only be effected in ending.

Meditation is thought freeing itself from continuity and then there is renewal, creation and reality. Our whole structure of thinking is based on the desire for continuity. In understanding continuity we can understand the significance of rebirth or renewal.

Our process of thought is based on time—yesterday, to-day and to-morrow. Yesterday coming in contact with to-day creates the present. Yesterday's memory continuing *to-day* in a modified or transformed manner is the present. The present thought has its root in the past and so thought is continuity. Thinking process is a process of time and therefore a process of memory. Since we do not understand the process of our thinking, which is the result of time, merely to deny continuity is completely useless.

If we want to understand the truth of continuity, we must watch it, go with it, every moment of the day. We are not concerned with physical continuity. What we are primarily concerned about is whether through things there is psychological continuity; that is, we are not concerned with the continuity of matter, but are concerned with the value we give to matter. We have seen that one of the causes of the havoc and destruction in this world is our extraordinary adherence to property.

We need a certain amount of food, clothing and shelter. But, the moment we bring psychological value into it, it creates chaos. The moment we use our position or property as a means of psychological continuity, there is chaos.

When we feel pain we take immediate action to arrest it. We do not seem to take such psychological action with regard to property, which means we are not aware of what we are doing.

Our desire for continuity has brought us to death, it has made us insensitive and inactive. Psychologically we have given ourselves over to property and so we are dead, because things are dead. So, we have discovered the truth that the moment we have continuity through property, we are dead.

Same is the case with regard to relationship. When we seek continuity through the family, we give importance to continuity and not to the family, and thus we are creating the nation, the group, etc. which leads to disaster, or to death.

Similarly ideas are also a form of continuity. We believe that we live even after our death. It is a belief through which we find continuity in some other quarter and at a different level. We cling to our God, our Truth, our Path and so on. So, the different kinds of organized beliefs have led us to division between ourselves, the Hindu, the Christian, and the Musalman and so on. There is only unity through intelligence and love. It is only when we recognize we are dead that there can be life. If we recognize we are blind, we would be careful and would not make any dogmatic assertion about anything.

What happens if one of your nearest relatives passes away? It is a great shock and a paralysis to the mind because you have invested your affection in him and he has come to an end, and suddenly you find that there is a psychological and physical breakage. You suddenly realise that you are alone.

As you do not like the loneliness, there is sorrow, not exactly because your relative is dead, but because you have discovered your loneliness which you do not like.

That is, as you do not like what you are, you seek continuity through property, relationship and ideas—which has led you to utter chaos and misery. We cannot proceed any further without the recognition of that.

If we recognize that we are dead, there will be a revolution in our daily life. There will no longer be the psychological attachment to name, to family and to position. There will be a revolution with regard to our beliefs, which implies the cessation of beliefs.

We have seen and heard about several revolutions which have all brought about misery. But a revolution which is completely different from the revolution of theory, is a revolution of values, a revolution of thought, which can only come about by the recognition of 'what is'. There is a revolution in thought when I know I am blind. My whole action will be different. Then I will be very tentative, very watchful; I do not accept, but listen, I move very slowly, my whole being is revolutionised. If I do not recognize that I am blind, my actions will be quite different. If we refuse to recognize what is, we cannot find what truth is, because truth may be in that which is and not away from it.

25-11-1947

Before we proceed with our discussion about continuity and death, I think we ought to consider for a few minutes the art of listening. In order to understand, you should listen without any apprehension, without any fear of loss or fear of pain. Because you are suffocated with so many erroneous ideas and beliefs, there is no immediate communication with one another. Communication is possible not when there is fear but only when there is love.

We ought to consider very deeply the attitude of teaching and learning. Is there such a thing as teaching and learning? Do you learn anything? You may learn a technique, how to play the piano, or construct a motor, or how to drive.

Our whole attitude towards life is the question of something we are going to learn, or something we are teaching. Communion with each other stops when there is this attitude of learning or teaching. There is beauty in real communion, which can only come with love. When there is, on the part of one, the attitude of learning, and, on the part of the other, the attitude of teaching, communion really ceases, and without communion, without partaking, without sharing, and without being together in good company, clear thinking is almost impossible.

During these few weeks of discussions have you learned anything? If you caught a few phrases or a few sentences from me, that is not learning. I was not teaching, but we were travelling together in deep communion, and therefore there was an understanding simultaneously, at the same time and at the same place.

A man who is merely teaching is not living any more than a man who is merely listening. If we can alter fundamentally that attitude of learning and teaching, we can enter into communion with each other. It is a mistake to go to somebody to learn. If you are enthusiastic and eager, then you will be able to share the wisdom, the song, or the truth with another. When a child is learning music, the teacher instructs him how to put his fingers and so on. But, if he is really interested, he would be pestering the teacher with so many questions about music; then the relationship between the teacher and the pupil is immediately changed.

We are used to being told or being directed; as such, I become the teacher, and you become the learner, which is really absurd. After all we are all human beings, not divided into the teacher and the pupil, and all the other absurdities.

We are here to find out what is reality, what is love, and not for me to tell you, and for you to follow. Now, if we can establish proper relationship, there would be a real affection and therefore a quick response.

In discussing continuity, we have found out that we seek continuity through name, property, etc., and that genetic continuance and physiological continuance have become extraordinarily important, as long as psychological continuance is maintained. This psychological continuance is doing great

havoc in this world, as can be seen from history and from what is happening nowadays.

Certain political systems have limited physical continuity. For instance, the father can no longer leave as before property for his son to inherit. But, there is the emotional continuity, the ideological continuity which ultimately brings about agony and misery.

Continuity is memory. All our life is a challenge and a response. There is the response to a condition and that condition is modified or altered according to circumstances, but it is always conditioned; and any experience which comes along is met through a screen of conditioned response. The conditioned response is memory. We experience, and we translate our experience according to our belief. Therefore, that experience is not fully completed. It is always broken down to constitute a particular condition and, therefore, there is never a complete action.

So, we, from day to day, carry yesterday to to-day and to-day to to-morrow and there is always the conditional burden of memory, not factual memory but psychological memory. The older we are, the heavier it becomes. This continuity is really decay, and the older we are, the more we are decayed, the more mentally sterile we are. I do not know if you have noticed that an experience that is followed through completely, leaves no residue.

Accumulated memory is static. It has no life unless we inject new life into it, i.e., by our recalling the memory, we revive it. By this static memory which is dead we translate life which is a living thing.

We believe in God, not knowing what God is. We cannot have an idea of something which we do not know. We know Him by reading books written by somebody else. Reality can never be described. A man who loves, may tell us what love is; but can we know love in that way? We can imagine about it. In the very telling of what God or Love is, we have put that into a small vessel, in our own vessels; and it is not Truth. The very description of Reality by a person who has experienced Reality, is a denial of truth. If we put Reality into words, it ceases to be the Real. We think about God as a form of security, as a form of gratification or comfort. In other words, we are not really seeking God, but comfort

through God. We seek happiness through things, property, relationship, etc. and, therefore, they become important. We do not know God and if we say that we are living in God, it is a form of traditional assertion.

Viewing it realistically, we can see that we love our family because it gives us joy; we love that which gives us pleasure, that which brings us a reward. As long as we are mutually agreeable, we love each other. It means that if we eliminate this pleasure or pain, there is nothing left, and so there is no love. We only know pleasure and pain and we do not know what love is. Therefore, to understand what love is, we must be free from pleasure and pain.

We do not know what God is, what Death is, and what Love is. These are the three amazing principles in life, of which we do not know, though we talk about them. So, the wise man says that he would not talk of them any more.

How can we find out what Love is? There are certain extraordinary moments in our life when we do love, i.e., when there is no pleasure or pain, when there is no relationship in love. These are very rare and extraordinarily beautiful moments.

Anything built on memory has no value; and as most of our relationship is built on memory, it has no significance. Therefore, how can our minds which are caught in the net of pain and pleasure be freed? Any action, inside the net, to get out of it, is still based on pleasure and pain. We have woven a net and brought everything into it. What is our response to this fact? We are looking at it through a screen and therefore we are not directly faced with it. The moment we face and recognize the fact without a screen, there is Truth. Since we are unwilling to face the fact we are hypocrites. So to get out of the net, we have, first of all, to be aware of the fact that we are hypocrites. The implications of this are tremendous. Love and hypocrisy can never go together. The very recognition of the fact that we are hypocrites or exploiters will bring about an instantaneous change in our actions.

We have met in this group not for learning as in a class room but to discuss with each other ; and, in exchanging our thoughts, we begin to discover our own process of thinking. This is a self-revealing process, not of some metaphysical higher or superior self, but of the self which is working through you and me. Without self-knowledge which is being aware of our own actions and our own feelings, there can be no right thinking at all.

Self-knowledge as distinct from factual knowledge or the knowledge of a technique, is not a matter of learning from another ; it can come about only through awareness. No understanding or comprehension can come when our relationship is that of the teacher and the taught, a Master and a Disciple, or a Guru and a 'Sishya.' Learning is not understanding ; it is really destructive, whereas understanding is creative. Understanding comes only through communion, which is possible only when there is deep love.

These discussions are meant to establish that extraordinary depth of understanding in which right relationship with another can be established.

We have discussed various subjects, the various hindrances to clarity of thought, also other things like "fear", "death" and "love".

Our whole social, economic and psychological structure is based on the desire for profit and gain, on pleasure and pain ; that which is pleasurable we accept and that which is not pleasurable we reject.

Our relationship has also a similar basis. I like you as long as you like me ; and if you do not like me, I find some one else. Our so-called friendship is really mutual gratification. Our emotional structure is based on this.

You love Reality as long as it is pleasurable or profitable to you ; when it is painful, you reject it and go to a guru or somebody else ; and thus you go on seeking gratification.

As long as the mind is seeking pleasure and avoiding pain, there cannot be love. We misuse the word love when we call this love. We do not really know what love means.

Since we do not know what it is to think rightly, deeply and profoundly, our solutions, political or religious, are in no

way going to produce a sane and balanced world. After all, the world is you and I; and it is no good trying to love each other when we do not know how to love.

It is no good discussing theoretically what love is. We can only start with what we know, i.e., by examining and becoming aware of "what is." What we call love is really based on the desire to please and to avoid pain. Actually, all our relationship is based on pleasure and gratification. Our desire for gratification pulls us along and pushes us also along into a mass of beliefs. From that relationship, we talk of having a duty, a responsibility, etc., which are all words having no significance, because they are merely based on gratification.

Some of you say that love gives you a sense of unity with another. Do you feel unity with the object you do not like? Obviously not. We give ourselves over to beauty and deny ugliness. That is, by the denial of vice, we become virtuous. We deny the non-pleasurable and hold on to the pleasurable. This self-immolation is an identification with what we call the beautiful, that which is intensely gratifying. We call that devotional love. Has that love any perfume or is it merely gratification?

You would not seek God if you do not want security, an ultimate permanency. In yourself you are insecure, the world around you is catastrophic, and you want an assurance of continuity; and, therefore, you want to identify yourself with what you call God. Therefore, you are not seeking God but only gratification. Gratification through God is just like gratification through drink though the one is a refined ideation, and the other a gross desire.

Similar is the man who identifies himself with an ideal like beauty and pursues it. As any ideal is only a creation of the mind, that too is impermanent, and that exists only as long as you find gratification in it and accept it. Thus, due to our inward poverty, we seek only gratification through things, relationship, and ideation such as God, ideal, etc.; we do not seek God or an ideal as we drop them the moment we do not find pleasure in them.

There are however certain rare moments when the state of non-relationship exists in contra-distinction to relationship which exists only on the basis of pleasure and pain. But in

that sense of complete self-immolation, there is no asking; in that state of non-relationship with another, when you love somebody, there is that quality of non-demand. At those moments, you are left silent; later on, further reactions come. It happens to some one, one in a million, and he is a happy man. Once he knows what it is, it is like a scent that is perfuming his whole life.

Why are we not awake to such moments much more often? Why do we not realise that our pursuit of drunkenness, God or an ideal is only the pursuit of our escape from facing the actual, and therefore reduces us to a state of dullness and insensitivity? It is because of various hindrances like conclusions, beliefs, trying to avoid death, worship of God and non-existence of affection. By being aware of these hindrances, they can be dissolved.

Is memory, psychological and not factual, a hindrance to understanding? Let us think this out. What is memory? Let us begin with ourselves and enquire into it without involving ourselves in explanations. Going back and looking into the past pleasures and pains, or going to the future with its hopes and ambitions, are forms of memory.

Why does the mind go backwards and forwards like this? In our attempt to understand the problem of memory, we have now found that mind which is itself a result of the past and is the current of the past, the present, and the future, has separated itself in the present from the current, as though it is a separate entity; it looks on itself as the thinker, the feeler, the perceiver, goes back to the past and says "I remember". It also conceives of the future, thus giving rise to three entities—the thinker, the past, and the future—as though they are different from one another.

The problem now is "Can the mind separate itself from the past"? The thinker cannot go back to the past unless he is the product of the past; therefore, he and the past are one and not separate. So, when I say "I remember", I am making a false statement. Memory is ever continuing from the past, in the present, and into the future. The past includes my parents, my forefathers and also mankind, with all their accumulations, traditions, superstitions, fears and conditions—social, economic, racial, religious, etc.

Thus when we enquire what memory is, we should know who the enquirer is. The enquirer is the mind which has separated itself from itself which is the past; and this division is a false action, because any product of the mind must, like the mind itself, be also a product of the past. The observer and the observed are the same; therefore, the observer is making a false statement when it says "I am looking at the stream and going back to the past". We now see the absurdity of the whole process—the observer, though the same as the observed, imagines himself to be separate from, and superior to it, and attempts to examine the observed through memory; finally, he realises that he is not separate from the observed and the separation was false.

In seeing the false as false, Truth is perceived.

29—11—1947

The desire to listen and the action of listening are two quite different states. Most of us are concerned with the desire to learn, to teach, or to acquire something, and in this, effort is involved. If you are interested in what is said, you listen without any effort, and there is communion. So let us listen as though we are really enjoying it, not merely putting up a resistance, or trying to contradict or trying to put your own ideas quicker than somebody else can.

We are dealing with memory, an extraordinary and subtle subject. The majority of us have not thought about this; therefore it requires an extraordinarily attentive mind to follow the current, the movement, the swiftness of it, because each of us is projecting his interpretation of what he considers memory to be. We have to understand the function of memory, either as a means to action, or as a means to understanding. I would suggest that you listen carefully and quietly rather than try to listen or concentrate on listening.

To me authority is binding and blinding. Where there is authority, you do not listen in the same manner as to some one who is talking with you in a friendly manner, and there is little communication. Therefore, do not look on me as an authority, but listen with affectionate and thoughtful attention.

We saw that memory is continuity. The self, i.e., the 'I' or the 'me' is a bundle of memories, or of qualities or tendencies accumulated through memory, the residual experience of the mind which is the desire, which is the 'me' moving in this continuity. This stream of continuity which we call memory, is a time-process, the time-process being the past, the present and the future.

The mind shuttles back and forward in this continuity and it is not aware that it is still a part of the continuity when it separates itself from the stream of continuity, and says 'I remember', 'I recollect', 'I hope', which is future action. When the mind says 'I remember', it considers itself to be separate from "continuity" and looks to the past or to the future, which are the same as 'continuity'. We have to understand why the mind, which is the thinker, the observer, the experiencer, the same as the current of continuity, has separated itself from this constant stream of continuity. The mind is not merely the superficial layer of consciousness but also the unconscious with its many, many layers which is all 'memory'. The understanding of 'memory' is directly related to the understanding of 'Love', 'Death', 'Reality'.

Why does the mind separate itself from the stream of continuity and say 'I remember'? The 'I' is non-existent if its qualities are removed. The 'I' is non-existent without memory, its tendencies, gifts and so on, i.e. non-existent without continuity, the racial, the traditional, the past in conjunction with the now, the past flowing through the present to the future which is hope. If we cannot understand that, we cannot bring about a regeneration, a renewal, an ending.

We discussed that what is continuous, the physiological as well as the psychological continuity, is binding, and that there is renewal only in death and not in continuity. There can be death as a renewal only when the whole consciousness is completely empty. For this to happen, every action that you meet, should leave no residue, and you should meet anew every experience as it comes.

The whole of our existence is a form of continuity and our whole tendencies are to generate one habit or another. The routine is a habit and habit is a form of continuity. Therefore, we have to discuss the action of memory on all our activities.

Technique is learning so as to be able to act in a particular manner without conscious effort. For instance, when you learn the violin, you learn the technique and the words of the song; but you do not learn the joy in the song i.e., in learning how to play, you do not learn music. Similarly, when I am learning engineering, I am learning facts. To be a creative engineer is different from the technique of engineering. Do you write a poem because you know the technique of writing it? We know factual memory, i.e., dealing with facts, talents, expression of talents, and so on. We translate them psychologically to suit ourselves whenever we make a response to any challenge we meet.

It is a fact that our society has recognized caste divisions and has viewed its citizens as belonging to a particular category and that your responses are therefore trained to the category to which you belong. Your whole attitude towards life is based on the division that you are this label. Though you are a human being like the rest, you function or respond only according to that label. You are thus conditioned by tradition to a series of memories that have been handed down by tradition.

What is implied in *thinking a thought through*? Here is a thought that we are aware of, that we have only factual memory of and nothing else. When I understand that as a false statement with all its implications, I am free from that false statement and therefore I see the truth.

The factual is the screen, is the 'me' in action with the residual, the unconscious 'me', which is hidden; therefore, there is always a conflict between the hidden and the factual. We are aware of the factual, the factual being the immediate whether the immediate is two to three days, or two to three years.

The conscious mind which is of the superficial layers of consciousness, is aware of the factual, because it is the product of facts learned at school or taught, the immediate response or immediate knowledge through books, through assertion, through techniques and so on. That is, the superficial layers of consciousness are factual memories. Through these layers everything is being translated and accumulated. That accumulation and the unconscious, the hidden as well as the

superficial layers, are the whole of 'me'. The hidden layers are all residues of all humanity, as you are not one isolated human entity but the result of the whole of humanity. You are only conscious in the superficial layers, i.e., only, factually; and these conscious layers are always translating and therefore misrepresenting, misinterpreting experiences that are being met, and are strengthening the unconscious by adding to it more and more.

As long as I have the screen of facts through which I translate every experience, the residue is falling below. If I have no screen then it will be quite different.

The problem is that I am only aware of factual memories and I am not aware of psychological memories. I am aware of facts, techniques and actions as memory. I have learned how to play and I translate every song through my technique. I have learned how to write and I am translating the untranslatable. Therefore, as long as I have a technique, the vision of a poem is always limited. As long as I have a technique, which is factual memory, I cannot find that which has no technique.

As long as my brain is made up of facts, techniques, discipline, everyday routine, it cannot find the immeasurable. After all when I write a poem, it is to think of the immeasurable. After writing it I think I am dissatisfied with it because I feel I have not captured the spirit; and in that very process I get lost; thus the process becomes much more important than the problem.

With this mentality of the awareness of the factual, i.e., through the screen of the conscious, we are trying to understand that which is not factual, that which we call Love, God, Death, the Unknown.

Consciousness comes into being when there is friction, when I meet a response, when there is disharmony. Consciousness begins when there is interruption. When I am awake and look at the trees there is no friction, there is no response. I am only watching the tree.

The pursuit of pleasure and avoidance of pain is consciousness. I am conscious when I want or do not want something. Previous to want and non-want, am I conscious? Are you conscious when there is no want and do you know that state? When I wake up, somebody comes and smiles and I

like it. It is friction. The fact is that I become conscious when there is struggle, either pleasurable or painful.

There may be various degrees of consciousness, friction, pleasurable or painful, and all the subtle variations of that friction. All that makes me conscious and from that I say existence is pleasurable or painful.

As long as there is effort there is self-consciousness, and yet you say I must make effort to free myself from greed. If effort is self-consciousness, then our whole process is effort; and therefore, we are merely strengthening the consciousness of the self. We are building walls and walls, and how can such a consciousness free itself from effort?

What is memory? Why has the mind separated itself from the current of time? How do I set about trying to find the truth myself? I must study the problem. I must not take sides about the problem. I must free myself from all prejudices. I must not be biased, for or against the problem. That means I must free thought from my bias about the problem, and I must come to it anew.

If memory is static or dynamic, the result must also be static or dynamic as the case may be. Memory by itself is static; it is dead, and is given life when I recollect it either as pain or pleasure. Who is the entity that recalls it? That entity is the result of memory. This has to be pursued and understood.

2-12-1947

It seems to me that, without self-knowledge, there will be no right thinking. I mean by self-knowledge, not the mysterious, the hidden, the super-self, the higher self, the Atman or anything of that kind; I mean the self that thinks, feels and acts now, here, in our everyday existence. Without understanding the thoughts, the feelings, the actions that we go through everyday almost automatically, without seeing their deep significance, there can be no right thinking. That is the self-knowledge I am talking about.

You must begin very near to go very far. It is no good beginning very far for coming near. Paramatman, the

super-atman and all the rest of it are mere assumption based on belief and therefore utterly valueless to a really thoughtful man. In discovering the process of our own thinking we shall find out—not through an authority, not through books, but for each one of us—whether there is such a thing as Reality or not. This idea that there is a super-self, is still part of thought and is therefore conditioned; therefore, the super-self cannot be superior to mind.

Wisdom is not found in books, nor in repetition, nor in rituals. Wisdom is found through right thinking and right thinking cannot possibly exist without self-knowledge.

I wish to talk to you to-day about "belief", a thing which is very near and in which most of us are caught. You may say that we have gone over that subject ten different times.

Mind is constantly wrapping itself in belief, belief in ideation, belief in memory, etc. Essentially we believe in order to be secure, not to get lost in the wood, to have a lighthouse, to have a point towards which thought is culminating, progressing, focussing. This focal point helps us to guide ourselves. A belief, whether physiological or psychological, is a necessity to him who is frightened. 'It is my experience and therefore I hold on to it as a guide, a conviction which helps me to progress in life'. Surely belief, a conclusion, a working hypothesis, a conviction, an experience which I hold on to as a guide, an ideal, a conviction which helps me to progress in life, are all merely a pattern, a mould in which the thought functions.

The ideal, the belief, is in the future, something projected or accepted by you as a pattern for you to be modified; and therefore it is in the net of time and therefore that does not lead you to the eternal, to happiness. The end is of the same nature as the means; if you use wrong means, you create wrong ends.

Are we aware of the fact that we have belief? Beauty is considered to be an ideal, a distant thing. The man who does not see the beauty around him keeps the ideal of beauty, and he has no beauty in him. There is beauty now, in the face that smiles, in the stars, in the leaves, and so on. Because we do not see that beauty, we have recourse to the ideal of beauty.

Some of you say that life would be impossible if we do not believe—for example, in the existence of London. But, several things are involved in this. That is the question of verification. You can ask ten different people and they will tell you where London is ; you can also go and see. That is verification. But you all believe in reincarnation or in something else of that kind, which is incapable of verification.

A million people tell me that they believe there is God or there is a Master. Does their belief prove to me that there is God ? Any belief that I hold, projects itself as an experience ; and then I say it is true because I have experienced it. I believe in reincarnation because it gives me a future chance, a psychological hope ; I project that hope, and experience it as an actual experience. How often you have heard people say " I know it, it has happened " as though there is no more to be said ! You can only verify when you do not believe.

I do not care whether the Master exists or does not exist, because I want to find out whether he is important in life. I find out that he is not important, and therefore I am not concerned whether he exists or not

Physical verification is one thing, and psychological verification is quite another thing. Millions of people can be made, by modern propaganda, to believe in anything—as it has been proved over and over again—in war, in nationalism, in butchery, in calling themselves Mohammedans or Hindus and killing each other

You believe in reincarnation. But it does not affect your life at all. If it has affected your life a single second, your attitude would have been quite different. So belief has no importance whatsoever, it is just a marvellous escape. Similarly, your belief in God is merely a matter of convenience to you ; it does not make any vital difference in your life.

Some one among you said that he believed in Communism because he saw its good effect. This means that you believe in what produces a good effect and you do not believe in what produces a bad effect. If you are concerned with the effect only, you believe even if a good result is produced through a bad means. For instance, you believe that by butchering and by creating misery now, you will produce peace and plenty in the future.

You believe in things that are gratifying. Whether it is true or false as long as it satisfies you, you believe in that. There is positive gratification and negative gratification. If I do not achieve gratification positively, I say 'no' and that denial also gives me pleasure. You are doing ceremonies because it gratifies you. When you say it is helping others who are dead and gone, you are bringing in a different problem; which means you are doing it on authority because your books say so, your grandfather did so, or your religion says so.

Your beliefs divide you into antagonistic groups. Beliefs induce mere habits which make you dull and which make you do things without knowing why you do them.

4-12-1947

We do not want to be uncertain, to be in a state of confusion. So, we use belief as the most gratifying means to guide ourselves. We are not discussing belief in an isolated manner, but as related to self-knowledge, the self which is in action every day—our feelings, our thoughts and actions from moment to moment—and to think out and understand the significance of every thought, every feeling as it arises, thus uncovering the process of our own thinking so that we perceive the state of our own mind, our own being.

Without understanding the creator of the self, the 'me' there can be no right action; and to bring about right thinking we must examine every thought fully and completely.

We shall take one subject, like belief, at a time and think it right through so that, at the end of it, those of you who are really earnest will be free of belief, because you will perceive the truth of belief. You cannot find the truth if you are on the defensive, if you are guarding yourself.

In belief is implied authority, an authority either imposed by a society, by a tradition, or the authority through experience in oneself, the authority of memory. You have an experience and you have learned something; and you use what you have learned to translate, interpret, further experience. Therefore, that experience which you have added becomes

your authority, which you call the 'voice'. But, essentially it is an experience which has left a residue of memory which has been used for translating further experiences.

Belief also implies specialization, i.e., if you have an ideal, an end, you specialize to achieve that. What happens to specialists? They are fixed either in knowledge, surgery, or moneymaking, etc. They are static and frozen. The man who specializes is immobile. He moves within the frame-work of his specialization which is always fixed. A thing which is fixed, is unpliable and therefore it is broken. All specialized animals are becoming extinct.

A man who is very firmly fixed in a belief is not pliable, and only that which is pliable, is enduring. I am not speaking of the pliability of a Hindu going to Europe and learning to smoke and learning to drink. That is stupidity. Pliability implies a freedom from anchorages, from specialization, from authority and so on.

Mostly, the actions based on belief, like ceremonies and rituals, are done by you without knowing why you do them. Therefore belief is binding and blinding and there is repetition of such acts without much significance.

You want to know the difference between a conclusion and a conviction. A conclusion is that which is based on knowledge or that which is inherited from one's parents, from teachers, from society and through environmental influences or those which one has made. After all, conclusions which one makes are the results of the past which is the conditioning of the environment and the tradition. A conviction is also based on the past. A man who has no past cannot have convictions. A man who is without memories cannot live in convictions. The more convictions you have the more enclosed you are. Therefore, conclusions and convictions are more or less the same and they are all conditioned. You cannot be free of them unless you recognize them as enclosures.

You say you have given up ceremonies now. Why did you give up? Did you give up ceremonies through understanding or through substitution? If you understand the true significance of ceremonies, they will fall off of their own accord. Otherwise, you will be merely substituting for them something else to which you will become a slave.

Most of you do ceremonies automatically, because your fathers and mothers have told you; it becomes a thoughtless action and, when you have children, they are also going to do so in the same way. If you have no belief in them but do them merely to please somebody, you are really indulging in an hypocritical action.

You say that you do not do the ceremonies but feed the poor on those days. Why are you feeding the poor? If you feed the poor because you love the poor irrespective of their class and caste, and not for capitalistic or communistic reasons, it is something.

Some one said that as you want to live peacefully without creating any disturbance, you do the ceremonies; but life will not give you peace and it constantly challenges you.

When you do not like any particular ceremony, you seek a substitution and do it; thus, you have given up ceremonies and taken to "poor-feeding." I am not concerned with the giving up of ceremonies; but I want to know why I do the ceremonies.

I heard someone of you say that you do the ceremonies because of an urge from within. We know the biological urges, hunger, sex, etc., and we can trace them to their cause. But, psychological urges are much more difficult to trace, e.g., the urge to be angry, the drive of ambition to become somebody, the desire for power, position, prestige, money, bigger house, etc. If you have an urge, it is necessary to find out why you have it and not to indulge in it blindly. The unconscious and hidden urges and thoughts are understandable if we give our mind to them, i.e., if the superficial consciousness is free and therefore in a state fit to understand them. If the urge on which you act, is a sane and balanced urge, it will tell you not to be greedy; but you do not follow that. You act only when the urge is pleasurable and not otherwise. That is why in this so-called spiritual country, the Brahmins who were once the highest expression of culture, have become degraded into shop-keepers and lawyers

We must understand the implications of obeying, and what it means to overcome or to sublimate something. Physically, when uncertain, you obey a signboard based on a physical fact. Psychologically you obey another because you are afraid. You command or obey when there is anxiety, a sense

of uncertainty. If you love, there is no question of obeying or commanding; you simply love each other. If I want to get something from you, physiologically or psychologically, I am dominated by you and therefore there is no love. So, you obey an authority either through fear or through a desire for a result based on your gratification.

You obey a tradition or what society says only when it suits you, when it is gratifying to you; because if you do not, you will be in anxiety. Through obedience, you think you will sublimate yourself. That is what all the religions have said 'Obey the Guru, obey the idea and you will sublimate' You have done this for centuries, and you are none the better. To sublimate something you must understand it; the moment you understand something you are free of it.

You say that by prayer and by performing ceremonies, you can get God to intervene in your personal affairs. God is something extraordinary and immeasurable; and it is fantastic to say that He speaks through somebody or is interested in any particular person. People accept that He speaks through Churchill for England, and through Hitler for Germany. We reverence such people instead of saying how ridiculous and how infantile they are. If God or a Master is really interested in me, He will tell me the whole thing and not little by little; He will also tell me to give up greed, not to hate, not to cheat and so on, which are much more important than ridiculous ceremonies or the renunciation of the world. An intelligent teacher or an intelligent doctor will surely ask you to get rid of the cause, instead of merely tinkering with a few symptoms. It may be that what you call your inner voice is merely yourself talking in the guise of a voice.

You say that you perform rituals because your deeper self says so. Why do you accept what the deeper layer of the mind says, without investigating it? That voice or command may be false. Whenever you obey commands of 'deeper self' or of God, you obey only in the most stupid things and not in the greatest things. You do not love your neighbour. If you really love your neighbour, there will be kindness, mercy to the animals, to the fatherless; there will not be any harsh words about anybody. You are obeying only that which is extraordinarily gratifying, like ceremonies. Therefore you do not really obey, but you are merely gratifying yourself. If

We have been discussing belief in relation to self-knowledge which is not understanding or the awareness of something higher, but being aware of every thought, feeling and action. To climb high, one has to go through the valley, through the turmoils, through the everyday thoughts and struggles and understand them. We are really reluctant to understand what is in the valley, the valley being our everyday existence.

How can we go far unless we understand what is near, the near being our relationship with ourselves and our neighbour, with family, etc. That relationship is an extraordinary self-revealing process. Because we do not want to go through that, we are escaping through belief, through ceremonies, and all other absurd and infantile things, giving them fanciful names without much significance.

It is very important to free the mind where it is, in your daily life, and to be aware of the words you use, the gestures, the attitudes, the motives, and the intentions. After all, what does it matter whether you believe in a Master or not, or what kind of ceremonies you perform? What does matter is what you are thinking, what you are doing.

A man who came to see me, wanted peace of mind. When I asked him what he was doing in his daily life, he said "That does not matter, I am only speculating". He is a speculator, dealing in money, bullion. How can such a man have peace of mind and how can he have God when he is hoarding, cheating, making people miserable by his actions? If at all he thinks he has peace, that will only be a deception, a self-deceit. To have peace, he must not speculate, he must not destroy others.

Similarly, those who wish to find Truth must free themselves from all bondages.

A man who believes is extraordinarily credulous, and therefore he is obstinate and therefore unpliant. A tree that weathers the storm, though it has deep roots, is pliant; but a tree which is still and not pliant, is broken down. In the same way, a man who is not pliant, who is credulous, who is obstinate, is broken down, and he is miserable.

Any two people can meet when they love each other. The man who loves another—his wife, his children, his friends, etc.—will not talk about ideals and beliefs.

What has happened to all the recent revolutions? They started out to establish the ideal of equality. This ideal was soon lost sight of. In the end, the man who is in authority has more power and more money than the man who is down below working in the factory, and therefore, they never meet. The only place where they can meet is their hearts; but there is no love there. Love alone can establish equality between individuals.

Let us try and understand what guidance means and why you seek guidance. You are lost, you are confused, you are in turmoil, you do not know how to behave; you do not like that state and want to get out of it to clarity. Therefore, you approach somebody else for guidance, to seek direction. It is like a baby who seeks guidance from the mother or from the teacher because it does not know and it is curious to know the name of the bird or the name of the tree and so on. You look to that somebody to show you the way on conduct—economic, social, spiritual, physiological, biological, etc.

What is the relationship between you and me? You are aware that you are confused, confused in relationship, confused in ideas, confused in society which is already confused—religiously and psychologically—everywhere you are confused, everything is on the decline. So, you come and seek my guidance to get out from there, on all the different levels of consciousness. If this is correct, then, you have made me your guide. But, I refuse to be your guide; I say "Look at your confusion", which you refuse. Therefore, there is no relationship between us.

Guidance is a false relationship between any two, between God and yourself. To look at the confusion, you must free yourself from the idea of guidance. Before you can find out the meaning of confusion you must find out why you seek guidance. Because I refuse to be your guide, you will go to somebody else; I am not in competition with other Gurus, but I want you to be free.

You seek guidance because you do not understand the confusion, the misery, the strife, the pain, etc.; and you believe that somebody else will help you to understand; you go to

is in such a frightful chaos when all the values have disintegrated, when the so-called democracies are also leading up to regimentation, surely those who have thought about the cause of the misery and the antagonism that exists, should attempt to bring about a new society and not merely the reconstruction of the old, because the old cannot be patched-up and even if it is patched up it will remain still the old.

As wisdom comes only with the knowledge of our everyday activities and feelings, we shall to-day take up the study of "evil" as a means of revealing the process of our own thinking. 'Evil' is a predominant factor in our daily life. All ideas are interrelated, and by examining one profoundly and following it through, you will see how extraordinarily interrelated they are.

Various philosophers in Europe and in this country, and various religions, have thought over this problem of evil. Great men have given their life over to its study. But, you readily throw off explanations without any thinking. Let us enquire into this like mature people and understand its implications and its significance, so that we may be able to alter the conduct of our daily life.

It is no use thinking about 'evil' according to what is written about it in books or translating it according to our experience. Our experience is itself "accumulated memory" which is always translating through the screen of personal advantages and gains. To understand a problem of enormous significance, like evil, your mind must be in a receptive mood. Just as the problem of labour cannot be understood if you approach it merely as a capitalist, or as a socialist, or a labourman, so also to understand the problem of evil, you must not approach it from any single point, such as sense of guilt, personal experience, selfishness, etc.

You say that whatever hinders progress, is evil. What is progress, what is evolution? The cart-wheel has progressed to aeroplane; the germ has become the child. We have progressed from the age of the arrow to that of the atomic bomb. Now, we have more breaking up of people than ever, more armies, more national feeling, more fear and more starvation. People have become more greedy and more cunning in a cunning society and more competitive in a competitive society. In spite of the havoc and misery caused

by the two world wars, many persons consider that war is inevitable and, in the nature of things, is a means to peace. Is all this progress ?

We have to consider progress as a means of human happiness, i.e., as progress towards human love, consideration, generosity, and charity. Have we evolved psychologically towards freedom and happiness ? There is more and more deterioration all round—tyranny, dictatorship, diseases, starvation, hatred, wars and confusion.

You say that God has a plan and anything that interferes with that plan is evil. This is the old idea of fight between God and Devil.

Look about you, and see what is happening in nature. One bird destroys another bird, one animal leaps on another, the snake lives by its poison and the strong live on the weak. There is continual strife to live by any means. The snake is the most extraordinary animal developing its own poison for its self-protection. There is a kind of snake in Brazil, which, to protect itself, becomes rigid like a bar of steel and cannot be bent. Perhaps, a snake is not cruel or evil at all. We call snake evil and kill it. Among us, the strong live on the weak, the clever live on the stupid. The capitalist is hoarding money and property at the expense of others. The books have said that they are evil, and yet we are doing that.

Inwardly, there is a battle between the opposites, between what I want and what I do not want. I am brutal and greedy and I do not want to be brutal and greedy.

We also want to survive physically as a person and also psychologically as the name, as an idea, etc.

Our everyday existence is confusion, ignorance, sorrow, pleasure, a constant battle, a constant strife. Has evil any relationship to this battle in us between the opposites or is it like Death, like God, like Truth, something apart from this everyday existence ?

Is 'evil' an idea which is used by the society to control man so that he does not go beyond the limits ? Organized religions have cultivated and controlled man by their laws through fear, through compulsion, through imitation, through fears of contradiction and has said 'You must be this'. When you go beyond those laws, they say it is evil. For instance,

him and expect him to resolve your confusion. Therefore, he becomes your guide. He tells you what to do. Gradually, your mind is filled with his ideas, his gestures, his words, etc., and he becomes all-important. Though you may say you have found the real Guru, the confusion is still there; only you have concentrated your attention on him, instead of on your confusion. Then, something happens and you feel lost again. You now say that your Guru is not such a nice Guru as you thought, and you go to another Guru. This is what has been happening for centuries.

Thus, in your every-day life, whenever you feel confused, you readily transfer your problem to another level—the Guru, the Book, the Leader, the Party, the System, the idea. But, the problem of confusion is still there.

You are unwilling to face the problem and, being unwilling, you have sought an escape in somebody who will help you to get out of the confusion. You have been practising for generations and generations to find a substitute to the problem. If you take a pill for indigestion and go on doing that, you depend on the pills and the pills become very important. Thus, your guides, the pills, have become important, and not the problem. You started to clear the confusion and ended with the pills, escapes from confusion. So you have got now the confusion and the pill; and instead of dealing with one problem you have two problems now. So, you multiply the problems, instead of seeing the one problem, confusion.

When you are confronted with the two problems, the pill and the confusion, what is your response? The pill has become more important than the problem itself; and so, the problem remains, and the pill remains! When you are confronted by this, when you understand how the pill is only an escape and does not help you in solving the problem, the pill gets away. You do not have to throw it away, or choose different kinds of pills. There is no question of choosing. There will only be choice when you do not understand the significance of the pill. The moment you understand, the moment you see something as false, it drops away.

Then there is only the problem left, and there is no question of turning to the problem.

In discussing this, you found that pills are distractions from the problem. You wander from one manufacturer to another, one Guru to another, and so your going from Guru to Guru has become important, not the problem. You do not want to understand the problem, because you believe the pill is going to solve it. But the problem is still there. If you see the significance of the pill, the pill is gone, and the problem remains.

Therefore, you must see the Truth in the false. The false are the pills, and the moment you see the truth of that, the false will drop away, and you do not have to see the latest pill.

When you realise that your beliefs and your guides are really escapes from the problem of your confusion, which still remains to be understood and solved, and that therefore they have no significance to you in regard to the solving of the problem, your guides drop away; and the problem of confusion alone confronts you, and you look at it whether it is painful, disagreeable or otherwise.

In this state, your mind is not distracted at all but quiet and passively alert in observing the problem without any effort whatsoever, i.e., your mind is fresh because it has seen the false as false; it cannot therefore translate or interpret the problem, but sees it as it is. Thus, the problem though old has become new, because it has not been faced before but only now. A new mind faces a new problem without any translation or interpretation according to a pattern, and it is eager to know all about it and, therefore, loves it. Love transforms; even the most ugly. Where there is love, there is instantaneous communication, confusion ceases, there is clarity; and the problem thus ceases to exist.

9-12-1947

Not only at the present time, but always, the fundamental truth is that man divides himself by beliefs, by systems. As nationalism divides human beings, beliefs break up friendship and creates animosity. At the present time, when the world

is in such a frightful chaos when all the values have disintegrated, when the so-called democracies are also leading up to regimentation, surely those who have thought about the cause of the misery and the antagonism that exists, should attempt to bring about a new society and not merely the reconstruction of the old, because the old cannot be patched-up and even if it is patched up it will remain still the old.

As wisdom comes only with the knowledge of our everyday activities and feelings, we shall to-day take up the study of "evil" as a means of revealing the process of our own thinking. 'Evil' is a predominant factor in our daily life. All ideas are interrelated, and by examining one profoundly and following it through, you will see how extraordinarily interrelated they are.

Various philosophers in Europe and in this country, and various religions, have thought over this problem of evil. Great men have given their life over to its study. But, you readily throw off explanations without any thinking. Let us enquire into this like mature people and understand its implications and its significance, so that we may be able to alter the conduct of our daily life.

It is no use thinking about 'evil' according to what is written about it in books or translating it according to our experience. Our experience is itself "accumulated memory" which is always translating through the screen of personal advantages and gains. To understand a problem of enormous significance, like evil, your mind must be in a receptive mood. Just as the problem of labour cannot be understood if you approach it merely as a capitalist, or as a socialist, or a labour-man, so also to understand the problem of evil, you must not approach it from any single point, such as sense of guilt, personal experience, selfishness, etc.

You say that whatever hinders progress, is evil. What is progress, what is evolution? The cart-wheel has progressed to aeroplane; the germ has become the child. We have progressed from the age of the arrow to that of the atomic bomb. Now, we have more breaking up of people than ever, more armies, more national feeling, more fear and more starvation. People have become more greedy and more cunning in a cunning society and more competitive in a competitive society. In spite of the havoc and misery caused

by the two world wars, many persons consider that war is inevitable and, in the nature of things, is a means to peace. Is all this progress ?

We have to consider progress as a means of human happiness, i.e., as progress towards human love, consideration, generosity, and charity. Have we evolved psychologically towards freedom and happiness ? There is more and more deterioration all round—tyranny, dictatorship, diseases, starvation, hatred, wars and confusion.

You say that God has a plan and anything that interferes with that plan is evil. This is the old idea of fight between God and Devil.

Look about you, and see what is happening in nature. One bird destroys another bird, one animal leaps on another, the snake lives by its poison and the strong live on the weak. There is continual strife to live by any means. The snake is the most extraordinary animal developing its own poison for its self-protection. There is a kind of snake in Brazil, which, to protect itself, becomes rigid like a bar of steel and cannot be bent. Perhaps, a snake is not cruel or evil at all. We call snake evil and kill it. Among us, the strong live on the weak, the clever live on the stupid. The capitalist is hoarding money and property at the expense of others. The books have said that they are evil, and yet we are doing that.

Inwardly, there is a battle between the opposites, between what I want and what I do not want. I am brutal and greedy and I do not want to be brutal and greedy.

We also want to survive physically as a person and also psychologically as the name, as an idea, etc.

Our everyday existence is confusion, ignorance, sorrow, pleasure, a constant battle, a constant strife. Has evil any relationship to this battle in us between the opposites or is it like Death, like God, like Truth, something apart from this everyday existence ?

Is 'evil' an idea which is used by the society to control man so that he does not go beyond the limits ? Organized religions have cultivated and controlled man by their laws through fear, through compulsion, through imitation, through fears of contradiction and has said 'You must be this'. When you go beyond those laws, they say it is evil. For instance,

organized religion has never said that ambition is evil, but has always decried sex. Don't you see the implications ?

Does evil mean to you a conquering of some temptation ? Buddha is supposed to have fought with "Mara" and won; Jesus is supposed to have been tempted by the devil and conquered it. Perhaps, we are thinking altogether wrongly, when we have the idea that there are evil forces in the world, the dark forces in opposition to the white forces.

So, to understand this, you must begin with yourself. You do something wrong, and you have pain. There is a physiological suffering and a psychological suffering ; they are not quite clear-cut. What is the cause of this suffering ? Is it easily dissolved ?

We need food, clothing and shelter. If I am satisfied with a few clothes, food and shelter, I will never come into conflict with another ; but, if I use food, clothing and shelter as a means of psychological exploitation, I will come into conflict

Someone of you advocated suffering as a means to acquire intelligence. Is one to cultivate intelligence through suffering ? Is not suffering an indication of ignorance ? I suffer when my son dies, because I do not understand the implications of death. Do I sit down and find out the cause of suffering, or do I run away to seek relief from pain with the aid of a priest ? If I want to go into the whole significance of death I must have intelligence. You say ignorance is a means of enlightenment ; that is, suffer more and more, and you will become more and more intelligent. Do you become intelligent in that manner ? Surely you will get intelligence *only through understanding suffering, and not through mere suffering*. So, when you say suffering brings intelligence it is not a fact. Through ignorance there can be nothing but ignorance. Through wrong means you can have only a wrong end.

As you have been constantly seeking escapes from suffering, you have become clever and intelligent in escapes ; but, you have not understood suffering. *To understand suffering, you have to live with it. To find the cause of suffering, you must go into it and not reject suffering. Understanding will come only when you give your whole being to understand the problem.*

Is evil the denial of good ? By denying evil, do you understand evil ? To understand anything there must not be denial, nor condemnation, nor identification with it. Take, for example, God. I am not talking about what the books say or about the images in temples ; that is not God. God is an unknown thing and therefore you must go to it with a free mind, without any conclusions or condemnations. So also, evil is not the denial of good. Beauty is not the denial of the ugly.

Is "evil" or "vice" or "the bad" the opposite of the good ? Is good the opposite of evil ?

Does not each opposite contain the germ of its own opposite ? Is fear the opposite of bravery ? If I am a coward, I want to become brave. In doing so, instead of understanding fear, I have tried to become brave. Therefore, bravery has an element of fear in it.

You say that a man in war is doing his duty ; but you forget that he is stuffed with propaganda of all kinds ; he is told that his country will suffer, and he is stuffed with rum before he fights. Is this doing his duty ? Even in the case of a mother loving her child, either she gives her life to it which is spontaneous, or it may be calculated, because, without the child, she is lost.

When I am stupid I want to become clever. Is not "becoming clever" a part of stupidity ? There is conflict between what I am and the thing which I want to be. The thing which I want to be is part of my own projection of stupidity. If I understood stupidity, then the problem ceases. The very awareness of the fact that I am stupid is the beginning of intelligence, and not trying to become clever. If I think in these terms, there is no opposite at all ; the opposite may be a fabrication of the mind.

Has not non-greed the element of greed ? When I am greedy positively in going after property, etc., I want to become non-greedy ; I am still greedy negatively in going after non-greed. I find greed does not pay and, perhaps if I become non-greedy, it will pay—which is still greed in an uncreative form. You will never understand anything by thinking in terms of its opposite. Similarly, if I am evil and I try to become good, the good has the seed of evil. Instead of pursuing and creating the opposite, if I say 'All right, I

am greedy, it is a fact', then, something happens and I cease to be greedy. The moment I recognize it, it falls away.

11-12-1947

We were talking about evil in relation to the problem of duality and the conflict of the opposites, i.e., about what is going on in the world—left against the right, the believer against the non-believer, the communist against the capitalist, labour against capital, arrogance against humility, good against evil, etc. Now, is there such a thing as the opposites?

Someone of you said that good is that which gives the greatest happiness to the largest number of people. Is this so? The fighting men are extraordinarily delighted and happy if there is war. They are relieved of their responsibilities and they are told what to do. The greatest number of people like to believe in some kind of superstition, whether it is the superstition of nationality, or of race, superstition of a scientific man, or religious superstition. So, can we say good is what gives happiness to the most? Obviously not, nor what is harmful to the most is evil.

Is that the way of discovering the truth of anything, bringing in the utilitarian point of view? Is it not the correct way to view the thing as it is, and not be confused by its effect or action on the many or the one? Can we not think directly instead of bringing in its action, whether it is beneficial for the many or for the few? After all, the State decides what is good for the people, whether the right or the left, passes certain regulations and laws and says that he who obeys them is the good, and the person who is disobeying it, is the evil.

Now, can you be called good when you are kind, merciful and generous spontaneously? Why do we name it? If a good action is said to be an example for others to follow, is it good? It ceases to be mercy when somebody imitates mercy. Why do we create these words, good and evil?

Let us consider the left and the right. Is the left different from the right?

The left is the idea that sensory values are the only values worth cultivating, giving happiness to man; and that, therefore, man through the control of environment can be shaped according to the edicts of society and the State; in that control there should be no values except the sensory values. The Socialist, the Fascist and the Communist believe in that, to them, the individual is not at all important, because he is merely the result of sensate values, to be controlled and shaped, or to be transformed and moulded, according to the desire of the State or what the State wants.

Then, there is the so-called opposite to it, the right—the absolutist as opposed to the materialist—he has only an absolute value which is God, in which is involved the priest, the Church, the organization. The capitalists who believe in the absolute value of God are sacrificing the individuals through exploitation, ruthless murderous exploitation, corruption and competition; during a crisis, like a war, they too adopt the same attitude towards the individual as the communist.

Similarly, the man who believes in the Church and who wants to spread religion as a means of salvation, believes in the good end and says "let us make this world as ruthlessly efficient as possible" and fights the man who is against the Church.

But are they—the Communist and the Capitalist, or the Materialist and the Absolutist—the opposites? Is there the dual, the sensory and the non-sensory, as two in opposite? This is a problem confronting the people all over the world, the religious person who wants to spread religion and the other wanting to spread his external, materialistic, dialectic conclusions.

We are trying to find out whether the left is an opposite to the right or is merely the extension of the right.

After all, without understanding the centre, the left or the right are the same. It is only when one understands the centre which is the individual from which the left and the right come into being, there can be true revolution, not revolution to the left or to the right. But, as long as you are thinking in terms of the left or the right, you cannot understand the centre.

The problem now is not whether the left is right or the right is wrong, but whether opposites exist, i.e., the problem

of thesis and antithesis, "this" opposed to "that". Is there such a problem, the capitalist opposed to the communist, the communist opposed to the religious, that which is in contradiction to that which is not ?

You are this and you want to be that ; you are ignorant and you want to be enlightened ; you are arrogant and you want to be humble. Or you are ambitious and ruthless, and you carry on. Thus, your whole existence is a conflict of the opposites. All your religious books and edicts are based on 'You are this and you must become that.' Are you satisfied with this struggle of opposites ? The clerk becoming the manager and the manager becoming the executive, is our whole everyday struggle. Should you not question it to find out the reason for this conflict, this ceaseless battle till you die and to be still wanting to continue after death ?

The conflict of the opposites exists in all the different layers of our existence—social, economic, political, inward, psychological, spiritual and so on. This is a constant battle between 'what you are' and 'what you would like to become.' As an example covering the whole of life—i.e., the Clerk becoming the Manager, the Priest becoming the Bishop, the Collector becoming the Governor, the ignorant becoming the enlightened, evil becoming the good and so on—let us consider 'arrogance'. I am arrogant and I spend my energy in becoming humble, adopting meditations, beliefs and ceremonies as helps to keep me on in this conflict of 'becoming' the opposite of 'what I am'. I have accepted this process of 'becoming' as the way of life, thoughtlessly and without any investigation, thinking it to be inevitable because all the religious people have told me like that. Is that the way to live ? In order to understand the truth about this, I should not accept any contradiction, though I am caught in contradiction ; but I must put it aside.

Someone says that, in order to bring about peace, you must go to war, if necessary, with the anti-social people. He believes, therefore, that war is a means to peace. In order to fight the communist or the capitalist, you must be as clever as he and should employ all his methods, his ways, his propaganda, and his ways of telling lies, i.e., you have to become himself. England has fought for years for the freedom of labour and now directs "

Our whole existence is this, fighting evil by evil means, but saying 'Well, I am not evil,' as though we are extraordinarily righteous. Wrong means will surely produce a wrong end.

In our everyday life, we have thoughtlessly accepted as inevitable this struggle of opposites—I am this and I want to become that—without knowing the whole significance of 'what I am'; so, the end also is bound to be thoughtless.

It is thoughtless on the part of an arrogant man to struggle to become humble; he will never become humble. What does 'to become' mean? 'I am this' and 'I want to become that.' 'I am arrogant' is a fact, and I know it. But, 'humility' I do not know; it is an objective which I would like to be. Humility, therefore, is not the actual; but arrogance is actual. I want to become something which I call the ideal. That is one part of the problem. The other part of the problem is the idea of becoming.

Is there a becoming at all? I know the acorn becomes the oak; this is not a becoming; it is what it is all the time and it has its own becoming. There is no becoming of an acorn into the rose or the pine tree. If you can understand the problem of becoming, then perhaps you will discover the truth about duality.

You are 'A' and you want to become 'B'. Now, what is 'B'? Is it not a negative response to what is 'A'? You are arrogant and the negative response is humility and you must become that. That is, you are arrogant; and negatively you are going to become that which is humble. You find arrogance not so pleasurable as you thought it was, because there is pain involved and arrogance does not pay you; perhaps becoming humble will pay you. Thus, 'becoming' implies a profit motive.

You say that you, being arrogant, want to become humble because then only can you get to God. This means that you want a result which is more beneficial, less harmful, and happier than arrogance. The real motive for a 'becoming' is for a profit, not only physiologically, but psychologically. You are 'arrogant,' the 'A'; and you want to get away from that. You begin to say that arrogance does not pay and

therefore you create humility, the 'B'; you try to become that which is non-existent, as 'B' is non-existent but theoretical and ideological. You have created the opposite 'B' which is non-existent and yet you are trying to become that. 'A' alone, arrogance, is existent. Because it is not profitable you want to become the opposite which is humility. When you examine the opposite and you see what is involved in it, you see that you have created it as a negative response. Therefore, in creating the opposite, the opposite has the seed of arrogance. 'B' has the seed of 'A' because 'B' has been brought into being through 'A'. It is only an ideological thing which is to be got and it is not existent apart from A. So, you have found out that the conflict between 'A' and 'B' is fallacious and does not lead you anywhere.

As another illustration of this conflict of opposites, let us take 'fear' and 'bravery'. You are afraid and you want to become brave, because fear does not pay in the world and everybody says you must be brave; which means, you want to become brave because you are afraid. The motive is still fear. Though you have taken the cloak of bravery, there is still fear. The intention in becoming brave is still fear. Therefore, bravery, as the opposite of fear, has the seed of fear.

Similarly about anger. We are not discussing how to get rid of anger. First, we must know what we are doing before we get rid of anger. You are angry and what is your response? You said to another something sharp and you regret; and you say 'I wish I did not get angry'. Again, you are angry and again you say "Awful, what is the matter?" and you create the opposite which is non-anger, because anger is very disturbing. If you can understand the conflict of the opposites, you may be able to deal with anger quite differently.

You are in a state which is very disturbing and you do not like that state. You like the state which is quite peaceful and more profitable. Therefore, you are moving from 'what you are' to 'what you want to be' as the opposite of 'what you are', with a motive for profit. The opposite is created on account of your desire for profit or benefit, for a result; it is non-existent. Therefore, the fight between the so-called opposites is between 'what is' and 'what is not'. How can there be a fight between one which is existent and some-

thing which is non-existent apart from it? It is only on the verbal level. Therefore, the fight is an illusion, a stupid and thoughtless action.

Conflict between the opposites—whether it is the left or the right, between capital and labour, between God and Devil, is non-existent; because, there is only one thing, 'what is'; and any movement away from 'what is' is stupidity. Therefore, the conflict has no significance.

To understand the disturbing state in which you find yourself, you must first stop the fighting with the opposite which is non-existent, i.e., you must give up the struggle to become the opposite. Do not condemn that state nor identify yourself with it. Then, watch it with your whole being and be aware of it.

Whenever we have a feeling, we generally name it so that we may recognize it and also communicate it, if necessary, to others. Investigation into and understanding of the feeling itself, which is changing and in movement, demands freedom from terminology, as the term is not the thing that it is supposed to denote.

If a feeling is investigated through a term, the term becomes important and not the feeling. When communicated to another, that other interprets the term or the word according to his own feeling. Thus, the term influences, modifies, and shapes the feeling. For the same reason, the word 'God' is not 'God' and yet it has become an extraordinarily important word. We shall discuss further this question of terminology in relation to feelings, at our next meeting.

13—12—1947

Before we begin with our discussion where we left off, it is very important to bear in mind why we meet as, otherwise, these discussions will deteriorate into mere intellection without any significance. I think one should distinguish between hearing inside oneself and listening. Listening is surely something outside. Hearing is much more subjective. Let us hear each other rather than listen to each other.

These discussions are really meant to reveal the way of our own thinking, feeling and acting. Right thinking begins only in discovering what is exactly taking place in each one of us—the illusions, the vicious motives, the intentions; being aware of all these leads to right thinking—i.e., through self-knowledge only can right thinking come into being and not through any book, not through any listening to a talk but by being aware of every movement of thought and feeling in ourselves.

We were discussing, when we last met, about the problem of duality, whether this conflict was inevitable—this conflict between ignorance and knowledge, between arrogance and humility, anger and peace, capitalism and communism, the left and the right, and so on. This conflict between the opposites has apparently been accepted by us as an inevitable fact in our life.

Is life meant to be a series of conflicts in the corridor of opposites or is our approach to the problem of the opposites wrong? If the opposites are inevitable, then the end of life is also a battle, because an opposite always creates its opposite. I am something and I want to become something else. I am arrogant and I strive to become humble; I am violent, and I want to become non-violent; I am greedy, and I strive to become non-greedy. That is what we have been doing in our meditations and in our daily existence.

Now, is the opposite a fact? Does the opposite exist apart from its opposite, as humility, as non-greed, as non-violence and so on? Is not every opposite a reaction to and result of its own opposite? As humility is a result of arrogance, humility contains the germ of arrogance. You find arrogance is not profitable and is a disturbing factor; and you have been told that arrogance is taboo socially, morally, and religiously; and therefore you strive to become humble which is more profitable. So your motive is still the desire to gain, the desire to become something. So humility contains the seed of arrogance.

Now, the fact is that arrogance is existent, but the 'being non-arrogant or humble' is not a fact. Humility is existent only in theory but actually it is not. The 'A' being arrogance creates 'B' which is humility; but the 'B' in itself is non-existent apart from 'A'. 'B' cannot exist apart from 'A'.

So, the conflict to become 'B' is illusory and fallacious. If you recognize the conflict to be non-essential and false, then the conflict ceases.

If good is the opposite of bad, goodness contains the bad because goodness is the result of its opposite, the bad. I am bad and I want to become good. The becoming good is the outcome of being bad. Therefore, it is still bad though I call it good. I accept this becoming good as long as it is profitable, as long as there is no suffering in it. The moment I suffer and the moment I realise that being bad is forbidden socially and religiously, then I try to become good. So, behind that becoming there is still the motive to gain a more profitable quality. Therefore, the good, which is the opposite of bad, is no longer good. If love is the opposite of hate, surely it is not love. If peace is the opposite of violence, then it is no longer peace because my trying to become peaceful is due to my finding that violence does not pay any more; the motive is still the same. If love is the opposite of hate, then it is the result of hate. Therefore, the conflict between the opposites is really a fallacious conflict; though we indulge in that, it does not lead us anywhere. If this is realised and understood, the conflict ceases.

Why do we name any quality? Perhaps, if we do not name it or term it, it may have a different significance. A quality arises in me, which I term as arrogance; and I either approve of it or condemn it. If I do not term it and if I do not specify the quality, what would happen?

Is the feeling different from the term, or does the term give significance to the feeling? That is, is the feeling apart from the term, or do I look at the feeling through the term?

The word is not the thing. The word 'God' is not God, and therefore the term is independent of God though you may call it God. The term has nothing to do with Reality. If the feeling and the term are two separate things, then in observing the term and understanding the process of how the term comes into being, perhaps we shall not confuse it with the feeling; then the feeling will have a different meaning, a different significance.

You have accepted the term God as God through temples, priests and sacred books; and so they have become important to you. If somebody says that what you have accepted for

seeks gratification through God and the other seeks pleasure through drink.

At present there is an increase, all over the world, in sensate values—more theatres, more cinemas, more drinks, more clothes, more and more. The so-called spiritual man, seeing this, says 'I do not like it', and follows his ideation; that is, he denies the sensate and goes after the ideation, as the ideation gives him pleasure. Thus, the spiritual man is also following the pleasurable, like the man of the sensate.

The man who is pursuing sensate values, is destroying the world; he is saying that there is nothing more than the sensate and therefore is indulging in the sensate in the most irresponsible manner regardless of the consequences on others. This has been shown over and over again by wars after wars. We say that such a man is a stupid man, materialistic, communistic and so on; and we try to get rid of him and to pursue our ideations.

The man of the sensate and the man of the ideational are meeting at the same point, both their values are based on the senses, though the man who says he is following the ideation, may do less harm in society. Obviously the sensate man does harm to the society; and the man of ideation is also creating harm, only on a different level because he has confused the term with Reality and the term becomes very important—your God and my God, your ceremonies and my ceremonies, or I am Brahmin and you are an Untouchable, which are the results of ideation.

So, just as the sensate man creates havoc in the world, the man of ideation with a framework of references also creates mischief; in fact, the latter does more harm. We can deal with a sensate man, because he is pursuing his pleasure through things; most of such men are poor and have very little means. The man who is pursuing ideation is much more dangerous, as he is pursuing pleasure through his ideas and as ideas divide man more than things. The Left and the Right are pursuing ideas and not things. If they were pursuing things, they would give us things.

Because the ideational man is pursuing the idea, he creates division between belief and belief, man and man; if he really gives his concern to men and to things, he would organize society on a different basis; there would not be your belief

as something superior to mine. But he would not do that because his ideas are more important. The system becomes more important than distribution and there is wrangling. It is not the things that are dividing man, but ideas. If that is understood, life would become very simple.

There is scientific skill in the world to produce things for everybody. There is knowledge at the disposal of man to produce enough food, clothing and shelter; but ideas of nationalities such as the Americans, the English, the Germans, the Russians and so on, are preventing man from making it effective. Therefore there is this mess and misery in the world.

If I say "I will begin to understand the sensate," I can proceed step by step into the deeper things. Then, I can find out whether there is Reality or not. But to assume Reality is an idea which leads to illusion.

Just as the word, God, is not God, so the term for a feeling is not the feeling. When we do not put a feeling in the framework of references, the feeling comes to an end, withers away. When we do not term our feelings at all, both the painful feelings as well as the pleasurable feelings, the mind will be still and there would be no reference to the framework of memory, and the feelings wither away.

Thus, the conflict of duality exists only when there is the naming of the feelings, and if we do not term the feelings, there is freedom from the conflict. What is then important for you is to find out, in your daily life, the truth of this; and then you will be content with a more peaceful and serene and intelligent life. When you come to that point you can find out the significance of life, what it really means to love, and not its dictionary meaning, not a philosophical meaning for you to follow. When we come to that point, we can talk of other subjects like dreams, whether the Communist is right or the Rightist is right and so on.

The understanding of Truth gives freedom and therefore happiness.

years as God is not God, it gives you a shock, the shock being the nervous response, a sense of nervous apprehension. But when you see that the term is not the thing, you are free of the shock. If you understand and realise that the term God is not God, it has an extraordinary nervous and verbal response in you; you are free of all the implications of the word God being accepted as God. Then the temples will have no meaning, whether we go to it or do not go, because the term is not the God; therefore, we are at once free from all priests, temples, churches and so on. There is no conflict of any going and worshipping in a temple because the image is not the Real and if you really worship, the image disappears. This can have action only when the response is nervous as well as verbal. But, unfortunately, your understanding is only verbal because if you say the word is not the thing and carry it out, you will have to go into conflict with your family and with society.

The term is not the feeling though it is made to represent the feeling.

Why is a quality or feeling named? The naming is done with a view (i) to convey or communicate the quality to others and (ii) to pin down or to evaluate the quality. In pinning down the new quality, the quality is recognized and evaluated in terms of the old frame of references based on memory. As the feeling itself is in the present and therefore new, whereas the references into which it is fitted by naming it relate to the past, the new is interpreted and modified in terms of the old, thus strengthening memory, i.e., the 'me'. The quality or feeling is thus absorbed into the 'me' and is given continuance in time as memory.

Without memory, there cannot be evaluation. The frame of references is the result of evaluation which is based on memory; so, it is the old. The feeling, when it arises, is new and in the present; when that feeling is termed, it is translated or modified so as to fit it into the old framework of references, memory, thus strengthening memory. So, in giving a term to the feeling, the 'me' is strengthened; and the person concerned feels stronger psychologically; when he says "this is my property", he feels already more powerful.

What would happen to a feeling if you did not judge it by the frame of reference—i.e. if you do not name verbally that

feeling or quality ? When there is a response to a challenge, if you name the response, you give it continuance because it is absorbed into the frame of references. Consciousness in all its different layers is memory, whether it is the memory of the Paramatman or of anything else ; and all such memory is the result of your parents and grand-parents and so on, or the result of books ; consciousness is still in the field of memory, you cannot think of Paramatman without memory.

Now, suppose a reaction arises and you do not name it. Then, you do not absorb it into consciousness, but you are merely aware of it ; the feeling and the response or reactions would cease after running their course ; the feeling is not judged or evaluated and it is not absorbed into memory.

We are all accustomed to name every reaction and refer it to the frame of references, memory, almost instinctively. But if you experiment with it and refuse to name a feeling when it arises in you, you will see that there is a time-lag, between the feeling and the naming. For instance, if a man treads on your feet, you have the reaction of pain, which is inevitable and cannot be helped ; but you do not hit back the man who has trodden on your feet. When you refuse to name it, though the reaction is there, it is not put into the frame of references. The pain has now a different significance. Next time, you will be more careful where you put your feet. Thus, by understanding the reaction, you would be observant and alert and be aware of what is actually taking place without the framework of references. This is intelligence.

We have now discovered that we are always fighting reactions without understanding their significance ; and if we do not name them, i.e., if we do not refer them to the framework of references, they wither away. This happens whether the qualities are pleasurable or painful.

Generally you accept the pleasurable and deny the non-pleasurable. When you deny the non-pleasurable, you are really strengthening yourself. The man who says he is seeking spiritual things, God, is also denying and pursuing the pleasurable.

There is very little difference between him and the ordinary man who is seeking pleasure. They are both seeking pleasure though in different planes of consciousness ; the one

seeks gratification through God and the other seeks pleasure through drink.

At present there is an increase, all over the world, in sensate values—more theatres, more cinemas, more drinks, more clothes, more and more. The so-called spiritual man, seeing this, says 'I do not like it'; and follows his ideation; that is, he denies the sensate and goes after the ideation, as the ideation gives him pleasure. Thus, the spiritual man is also following the pleasurable, like the man of the sensate.

The man who is pursuing sensate values, is destroying the world; he is saying that there is nothing more than the sensate and therefore is indulging in the sensate in the most irresponsible manner regardless of the consequences on others. This has been shown over and over again by wars after wars. We say that such a man is a stupid man, materialistic, communistic and so on; and we try to get rid of him and to pursue our ideations.

The man of the sensate and the man of the ideational are meeting at the same point, both their values are based on the senses, though the man who says he is following the ideation, may do less harm in society. Obviously the sensate man does harm to the society; and the man of ideation is also creating harm, only on a different level because he has confused the term with Reality and the term becomes very important—your God and my God, your ceremonies and my ceremonies, or I am Brahmin and you are an Untouchable, which are the results of ideation.

So, just as the sensate man creates havoc in the world, the man of ideation with a framework of references also creates mischief; in fact, the latter does more harm. We can deal with a sensate man, because he is pursuing his pleasure through things; most of such men are poor and have very little means. The man who is pursuing ideation is much more dangerous, as he is pursuing pleasure through his ideas and as ideas divide man more than things. The Left and the Right are pursuing ideas and not things. If they were pursuing things, they would give us things.

Because the ideational man is pursuing the idea, he creates division between belief and belief, man and man; if he really gives his concern to men and to things, he would organize society on a different basis; there would not be your belief

as something superior to mine. But he would not do that because his ideas are more important. The system becomes more important than distribution and there is wrangling. It is not the things that are dividing man, but ideas. If that is understood, life would become very simple.

There is scientific skill in the world to produce things for everybody. There is knowledge at the disposal of man to produce enough food, clothing and shelter; but ideas of nationalities such as the Americans, the English, the Germans, the Russians and so on, are preventing man from making it effective. Therefore there is this mess and misery in the world.

If I say "I will begin to understand the sensate," I can proceed step by step into the deeper things. Then, I can find out whether there is Reality or not. But to assume Reality is an idea which leads to illusion.

Just as the word, God, is not God, so the term for a feeling is not the feeling. When we do not put a feeling in the framework of references, the feeling comes to an end, withers away. When we do not term our feelings at all, both the painful feelings as well as the pleasurable feelings, the mind will be still and there would be no reference to the framework of memory, and the feelings wither away.

Thus, the conflict of duality exists only when there is the naming of the feelings, and if we do not term the feelings, there is freedom from the conflict. What is then important for you is to find out, in your daily life, the truth of this; and then you will be content with a more peaceful and serene and intelligent life. When you come to that point you can find out the significance of life, what it really means to love, and not its dictionary meaning, not a philosophical meaning for you to follow. When we come to that point, we can talk of other subjects like dreams, whether the Communist is right or the Rightist is right and so on.

The understanding of Truth gives freedom and therefore happiness.

I wonder how far you have been experimenting with what we have been discussing, namely, the problem of conflict and effort which brings about duality, the opposite, and the problem of terming a feeling. I wonder what has been the result of it and whether it has any fundamental effect on your daily activities. Do you translate into action anything that you hear or do you just let it pass by ?

To-day, let us try and find out the meaning or the significance of 'not terming a feeling' in relationship, whether with your family, your boss, or your clerk—in your daily life.

Can you live in relationship with another "without naming a feeling" ? Let us suppose that you are really serious in experimenting with this in your relationship, for instance, with your wife. What will this lead to ? You are irritated with your wife when she says something which you do not like. You retaliate. A few minutes later, you say to yourself, "Well, what about the discussions I had in regard to 'not naming a feeling' ? I will not name the feeling in future ?" Similar occasions arise again. Then, if you experiment with this earnestly, you will find that the time-interval between the instinctive responses and your thoughtful responses gradually gets less and less, and that, in the end, you do not instinctively respond, but you watch yourself and do not name the feeling that arises in you, with the result that you do not get cross with your wife. You are now calm and quiet whatever your wife may say or do. Your wife will probably get more and more irritated with you on this account ; she is not thinking along the same lines as yourself. At this stage, you may turn away from sensate values, but your wife may be caught only in sensate values. She feels miserable ; she feels thwarted because she does not get the things she wants. She has children ; yet, she does not find love in them and therefore seeks an expression of love in things—car, house and other things of life. You try to talk over matters with her but she refuses to listen to you and becomes firm in her stand for things. What do you do ?

A friend advises you to effect a compromise with her by handing over your cheque-book to her. You try this method. She does not want your cheque-book because what she wants

is your heart which you are not giving her. You find that compromise is only an intellectual and verbal balance between two people who do not understand each other but who are tied by social conventions, and that, therefore, compromise is slow death.

You get exasperated and begin to talk over the matter with her seriously. She retorts and says to you "I want a car, a house, and a few things of life, because I know you are slipping from me. You have not given me your love. You are now slipping away from me into a realm which I cannot possibly understand and enter. I would like to follow you but I cannot. I have a child to look after. I have no love. If I had love, it would have filled my heart. I have not got that love at all and the love of the child is very little; the child does not know of love and it only clings to me. I have not the love which replenishes and fulfils my life. So, the child, the house and the car have become enormously important to me. I am quite different physically from you because I bear children. I am therefore more conservative and I want security. Emotionally, I am not so concentrated as you are. We have not loved each other and so the child has become all important. When I grow old and the children go away, what shall I be left with? An aching memory, a drudgery kitchen, an ailing husband who does not know what it means to love; and a frustrated life. I am even now feeling frustrated. That is why I am irritable, nervous and anxious. You are going one way and I another way. Where do we meet? We have never met except in bed; now, there is not even that. You sought pleasure with me to further your name, and I became your cook and bearer of children. You are now trying to educate me, which you never did before. You are now more and more alert. So, I have become anxious. You now talk of love and all the rest of it but you have no love for me. You do not understand me at all"

Now, you realise the need for your wife and yourself to understand each other. When you sincerely begin to understand her, you will have consideration and affection for her. You will try to find out all about her, her physical condition and her nervous responses. In understanding her, you will understand her desire for things. With mutual understanding, there will be love; and the problem will then cease.

Thus, you will find that, if you do not term the feelings, the implications are extraordinarily significant in relation to your wife or in relation to society, whether Communist, Capitalist, or something else.

What is your relationship to property or things, if you do not name or give a term to a feeling, whether pleasant or unpleasant? You all own property. You all have titles, B.A., M.A., Judge, Doctor, etc. What will happen to your feeling of ownership—'my' property, 'my' wife, 'my' son, 'my' title—if you adopt this suggestion of 'not naming the feeling' and relate it to daily actions in which there is the feeling of ownership or possession?

If you are not naming a quality or terming a feeling, then the feeling dies away. Similarly, if that quality which we call acquisitiveness is not termed, the acquisitiveness withers away. When you do not name the feeling, then life becomes very simple.

Naming a feeling is giving it continuity whether it is pleasurable or painful. How do you relate it to your property? If you change your name into "Swami something," it means only that name is more important. But, what happens when I drop my name, not literally, but when the content behind the name has completely gone out of it? I am not lost if somebody calls me by another name, but you are; because round the name, there is a feeling—the ancestral, Brahmanic, etc., the feeling of property which you are going to leave to your son—which is the very thing which you deny verbally, theoretically, when you want not to name a feeling. But you are attached to your name because of the content behind the name or title.

To name a feeling, whether it is pleasurable or painful, is to give it continuity, to give birth to itself repeatedly. If you are serious in the search after Truth, you are bound to drop the naming with regard to property which is bank-account, the cheque-book, the stored-up money, etc.

Generally, you are concerned only with words and not with feelings. If I flatter you, you are pleased and if I insult you, you get annoyed. Should not a wise man be indifferent to flattery and insult?

If I am not a scoundrel and somebody calls me a scoundrel I want to find out, I want to discover whether he

is correct. If I am a scoundrel and somebody calls me as such, and if I do not want to be discovered as one, I get annoyed. In other words, this irritation is a process of self-protectiveness. The proper attitude is for me to know in what way you think me a scoundrel.

Similarly, the use of titles is a form of exploitation. Mrs. Smith, if she calls herself Lady Smith, gets better treatment. She finds others snobbish and she wants to exploit their snobbishness by using titles.

How are you to deal with property? Can you give up your property by saying that you are not going to name your property? You say that you will use your property only for your needs and that you will discourage acquisitiveness.

It is a wrong question to ask where to draw the line between needs and acquisitiveness, because you will have always needs. *Acquisitiveness creates needs.* You can find this out for yourself when you go to a shop.

Then there is the use of property as a means of self-expansion, and the use of an organization as a means of self-fulfilment. You belong to a certain society, a certain group because that group of people have property, shelter or an idea which is extraordinarily useful to you. So, belonging to an organization whether it is the Hindu or the Muslim and so on, is for self-expansion. If all these things drop away, you would be happy people, you would not be merely talking about brotherhood, but you would spread kindness and would love others.

Now your love is concentrated in property and, therefore, you have little love for persons. Naming the property, i.e., identifying and giving continuance to the feeling of acquisitiveness, is one of the problems which is creating terrible havoc in the world. The man who uses a title, who is acquisitive, can never be happy, never be brotherly, though he may talk about brotherhood and happiness. Mere giving up of property or title, outwardly, will not solve the problem; you can give up the content of property or title only when you understand its whole significance. If you do not understand the whole significance, the remnants of acquisitiveness will still remain in the mind. This is really difficult because, psychologically, you are the property. Without it, where are you? The moment you let it go, you feel lost.

To let go name, title, and property requires an extraordinary inward richness; it means freedom from outward things; you can let them go only when you have something real in yourself. You do not let them go for the simple reason that the property is you, the title is you, the name is you; this means the sensory things are you. The moment you do not identify your name, do not give a name to that feeling of being lost or being nobody, it comes to an end. Then, the property will drop away and you will not care two pins.

So, the emphasis is not on property—which the Communist, the Socialist, or the Capitalist is emphasising—but it is on the significance property has for you. When you have inward riches, property does not matter; and there can only be inward riches when you do not name the feeling; through that door you find the imperishable. The man who is talking about the imperishable and is naming his feelings is a hypocrite.

It is only when you do not name your property, acquisitiveness will cease to be. Then, you will know the difference between the needs and acquisitiveness. You need food, clothing and shelter. But, when you seek psychological satisfaction through property, name or title, they are no longer needs, but become potent factors in making you more and more ruthless in acquisitiveness.

From this, you will see that only when you would understand the whole significance of not naming feelings in relation to title, property and relationship with others, and when you do not name such feelings in your daily life, there will be a rich transformation within yourself whereby you will bring about a creative society.

18-12-1947

On the last occasion, we found that the conflict of the opposites is really fallacious, because the opposite is the non-existent, which has been created from 'what is'; and that the becoming into something other than 'what is' is the oppo

site; we also discussed the whole significance of terming a feeling, the reaction to a challenge, and that from that naming there are a series of reactions and in these reactions we get lost. So, the becoming is the conflict. Then the naming of the feeling is perhaps wrong because the feeling is new but it is put in the framework of references, thereby interpreting the new feeling through the framework of old references and therefore misinterpreting the feeling. If I had not termed it perhaps I would have a different reaction to the feeling, and the feeling may then subside. A feeling which is termed, whether unpleasant or pleasant, can come to an end if you do not name it. If you have a feeling of anger and if you do not name it, then you will see that it withers away. But, is love a feeling which, when not named, will come to an end? We have discussed further about terming a feeling and what effect it has in our daily life. We also discussed about property and what happens if we do not name it.

[Then the discussion went back to the question of belief, ceremonies, etc., which had already been discussed in detail, as these questions were brought up again by some one present.]

20—12—1947

You have suggested that, to-day, we should discuss together the practical steps to be taken by us in our daily life to give expression to the ideas we have hitherto considered, especially in relation to property.

Property implies continuity, acquisitiveness, possessiveness, domination, suppression, economic relation between man and man, ill-will, nationalism, war and peace, and all the rest of it.

We consider practical steps in order to achieve an ideal, to achieve something, to achieve a result. This suggestion implies that what we have been discussing is impractical and that, being only theoretical, they need translation in our daily life through a certain set of regulations or practical ideas. It also implies that we do not understand the implications of that

idea in regard to our daily activities now, and that by doing certain practices leading to a particular way of living, you will, in course of time, understand the implications.

Let us take, for instance, nationalism. How can you be practical about nationalism? If you understand it and its results in daily life, it drops away from you. You do not become international; you cease to be national and therefore you are a human being. How can you have a practical step to cease to be national?

Either we understand nationalism and its implications immediately and it drops away; or we do not understand and we think that, by doing certain actions, we will understand later. We know that nationalism causes separatism, exclusiveness, friction, ill-will and enmity. It acts as a barrier between people and prevents sane living. If I have more than I need of property, names, titles, etc., then they will cause envy. Similarly, if I say I am an Indian, I am a Hindu, and my whole patriotism is given to India, I am exclusive. It is the process of exclusiveness which ultimately leads to war.

Or you say that you must go through separation, through nationalism, in order to become international. That is, you must first be a Hindu and yet become brotherly with other people who call themselves by different names. Is that possible? If you call yourself a Hindu and I call myself a German, can we two meet as brothers? You keep your nationality and I keep my nationality; and can we two meet? Obviously we cannot, because we are more concerned with our names than with being really human. So you see the fallacy of saying that through nationalism we can become international though lots of people talk of it.

Nationalism in itself is an exclusive process and it is of recent growth caused by competition, economic frontiers, etc. It is not conducive to peace. The more you are national, the more you are identifying yourself with what you call your country in order to be something. If you are nobody you feel rather frustrated. One of the effects of industrialization is to make you more and more mechanical and less and less important.

How can you be more practical if you do not see the significance of nationalism in all its different layers so that it may drop away of its own accord? If you have the intelligence

to see that it is a cobra, you do not have to take practical steps to fight it. You just leave it alone. You want to have open relationship with others; you also see that nationalism is a poison which has degenerating effects in human relationship. Therefore nationalism drops away. You may have a little reaction when you hear that India beat Australia in cricket, but it does not become a problem.

So, your difficulty lies in seeing the thing clearly without any prejudice. The prejudice has been created by outside agencies as well as yourself. With regard to every subject, you are misinformed, you are badly educated and badly conditioned; and you try to interpret life through this misinformation. When you realise that your information is wrong you immediately put it aside.

You like to identify yourself with your country because it gives you a sense of warm feeling which can be whipped up to kill somebody. You become national and you like it because it gives you a warm sense of feeling that you are achieving something. So there are more soldiers, more armies, more dreadfulness. That is what we are achieving and that is not progress. Progress does not obviously lie through bloodshed.

There are only six countries, I believe, that can feed themselves; every other country is dependent on somebody else. Therefore, why not destroy all the frontiers and come together as human beings to meet our necessities of food, clothing and shelter? You want to know who is to do this. You and I have to do this. Who else is going to do it? Certainly not the capitalists, certainly not the political party—either the Left or the Right—because they are committed. So, who is to do it except those people who see the thing clearly?

Nationalism is a modern invention, and it is really non-conducive to peace; it acts as a barrier between people. There is no practical step regarding it; either you see the thing or you do not. Your prejudices stand in the way of your finding it out.

You must see the whole significance of the idea of acquisitiveness which is expressed through property, through relationship and through ideation. I am not talking about merely the ethical, the moral or the religious, but the actual process of acquisition and what is implied in it.

What are the effects of acquisitiveness? One is nationalism and another is the competition between you and me; another is the moral and social degradation in which is involved the whole idea of division of the high and the low.

Psychologically, it is very gratifying to own something; it feeds your vanity, you are somebody then. The effect of acquisition gives you a sense of life, a sense of struggle, a sense of existence. If you do not acquire what are you? You are nobody if you have no title, no property, or no name; and therefore things become important. Because inwardly you are nothing, you wish to acquire, which implies power, prestige, title and all the rest of it.

Then, mentally, you want to acquire knowledge. You are anchored to acquisition and you become a mental addict who always reads. A mind that is merely acquiring, ceases to function as an instrument of thought, it inevitably becomes dull without any pliability, it is slavish, it is uncreative, it is repetitive because it is merely acquiring what it calls knowledge. So, acquisition through experience, through memory, or through knowledge and all the rest of it, is really a factor that dulls the mind and cripples thinking. To think, you must be free and not be anchored to acquisition, to property or to belief.

You may have no property, but mentally you may be anchored to acquisition, a mental addict who reads and reads. You should understand the significance of acquisition which is expressed in property, which does not mean that you must not have a little money, especially as the society around you is based on money. Some property, i.e., food, clothes and shelter, is necessary for you and you must have it; but it should not become a psychological need.

When you understand the significance of acquisitiveness, it is very simple to deal with property. You may prevent, by legislation, the acquisition of property; but people may still be acquisitive in some other direction, which may be equally disastrous, like knowledge which gives one an extraordinary sense of superiority. What is the practicability wanted here? The problem is how to give up the property or how to arrange the property to suit your convenience. You can only deal with it when you understand the full significance of it.

What is your attitude to property? Are you depending on legislation with regard to your conduct towards property? The world is confused; and the more it is confused, the more the individual wants security, i.e., you want to be secure. This leads to conflict in you as well as outside you. This conflict will cease only when you understand and are aware of the significance of acquiring property; then there will not arise the question of how you will escape from the conflict.

There are various forms of relationship—such as relationship with things which are considered to be property, relationship to the bank account, relationship to law which sustains the property; and the relationship to human beings. The relationship to human beings is more difficult and more subtle; and the difficulty arises when there is no love. Love cannot be learned through Pelmanism, through practice, or through following some steps. If there is love, you will understand relationship; love will then show the way out of this horrible mess of husband and wife and relationship between man and man. Why don't we love? What is preventing us from loving? If you can find out the cause, perhaps you may know how to love. Love is not something abstract, but it is an extraordinary sense of intelligence, a heightened form of intelligence. If you are intelligent, then perhaps there will be love.

Why is it that the relationship between man and man has become so difficult? It may be because they are not dealing with it intelligently and they do not know what intelligence is. Perhaps you can find out what intelligence is, negatively.

My relation with you is society. The society is non-existent without you and me. The group is you and me: you and I create the whole structure of society. When we examine the relationship between one another now, we find there is conflict. Average existence is a conflict. To deal with this conflict intelligently, I must examine the relationship as it is and not as I would like it to be.

I notice conflict in my relationship with my wife. To understand this, I must, first of all, know if I am related at all. If I am really related, there should be communion, exchange of feeling and thinking out of the problem together. To be is to be related. I have taken it for granted that I am related to my wife; perhaps I am not. There is no real contact with

her and so I remain isolated. Yet, I think I am in relationship with her; and so, 'relationship' may be merely an expression or a term without any meaning; because if I am related to her, it will have a different meaning.

Can two entities in isolation live together? If my whole motive is to be isolated, is to be self-protected, is there any relationship? So, the problem is not that I do not love her or she does not love me, or she dominates over me; but perhaps she and I are not related for the very simple reason that she is exclusive in herself and I am exclusive in myself. That is our daily activity—I with my interests and my purposes and she with hers. We say we are related, but we two are working exclusively in ourselves. Therefore the next question is: why am I doing it?

It is suggested that common interest brings about communion. Is it so? You and I are interested in education, we both have common interests and we belong to the same society. We meet in the temple; but, in the market, we cut each other's throat.

Why does each one of us, in our relationship with one another, try to isolate oneself? Is this inevitable in the sense of a rose becoming a rose? Is this process natural? If it is natural or inevitable, then there is nothing more to be said about it, and there will be constant conflict between you and me; there will be no peace between you and society, between you and myself. If it is inevitable, there can never be love, nor a moment of complete quietness between us. We know of moments when there is creation, though such moments are rare. Creation takes place not in conflict but only when the conflict ceases, when there is silence, when there is a sense of fullness. So, we find that the conflict is not inevitable. We have now to understand why we isolate ourselves in relationship.

It is said in all religious literature that, to find God, you must withdraw and be alone. When you seek God, Reality, Truth, you are alone not because you want to be alone but because a lot of stupid people around you force you to be alone. You say nationalism is wrong, Brahmanism is wrong, etc.; but society will not accept all this because it does not like to change. So, though you do not push yourself away

from it, the society pushes you out and then says that you must be alone to find out Truth.

Nobody can be alone; he is always in relationship with the person who gives him food. He is alone only in repudiating the faiths and refusing the things which society accepts. So, it is a wrong conclusion leading to illusion, that you must be alone to find God. I now see that I would be acting falsely if I am isolating myself because society has been telling me that I should be alone to find Reality.

On examining further, we find that one of the reasons for exclusion is labour, functional existence. We are isolating ourselves according to function. Functions have become very important in our life for the very simple reason that our life is based on sensate values. Through functions, I am isolating myself because I have divided life into categories of functions, higher and lower, like minister and scavenger, etc.

Why are we isolating psychologically? I am living in isolation and my whole struggle is to live in more and more isolation. I live with my neighbour and he is also doing exactly the same as I am doing. I know that isolation is not an inevitable process. Then why do I psychologically isolate myself? My strife is to protect myself. Similarly you are protecting yourself. This means mutual self-protection for avoiding a conflict.

But, we have not understood self-protection. After all, any enclosure, psychological or physical, is self-protection, is isolation. I put a wall around myself, psychologically, for the obvious reason to protect myself. The more I try to protect myself, the greater the isolation, the greater is the conflict. Protecting myself by putting a wall psychologically around me creates a barrier. You have a wall around you and I have a wall around me and we keep on strengthening our respective walls. When you and I thus come in contact, what will be our relationship? The more I am enclosed in myself the more violent I become, the more aggressive I am; similarly you.

To have right relationship, this barrier of psychological enclosure around each one of us has to be pulled down. Obviously, as I cannot do anything with others, I must first start with myself and set about to pull down the enclosure which I am putting up around me for self-protection.

Relationship, as it exists now, is one series of conflicts, giving in at one time and getting upset at another time and so on. It is a constant battle between yourself and your wife, between yourself and society, a constant friction, maladjustment, struggle and contradiction between two people.

We are not discussing what should be the ideal form of relationship. The ideal is a real curse because it really prevents you from understanding what is; if you accept and work towards an ideal, you merely conform, without understanding the significance of relationship; you do not understand what your relationship actually is and what it means. Are you at all "related", you and your wife, or your neighbour and yourself? Though you live together and have children, though you wrangle and fight, is there any "relationship" between you and your wife? If you examine yourself, you will see that your whole intention, your whole pursuit, is an isolating process. Each one is isolating himself or herself, in possession, in name, in power, in money; each one builds a wall around oneself and says "I am related". We look over the enclosing walls occasionally when it is suitable and convenient; but, most of the time, we lurk behind the walls. This process of isolation is considered "relationship"!

In daily life, we are isolating ourselves by our activities; we are separating ourselves through function—the bank clerk and the manager, the labourer and the executive, the priest and the bishop, the man in the street and the rich man, the ignorant and the learned, and so on. We are constantly erecting enclosing walls around ourselves, and yet we try to be "related". When there is this constant erection of walls and isolation, conflict is inevitable. The more one is enclosing, the more the struggle and the violence.

Is this isolation by the erection of the enclosing wall a natural process like the fall of an apple from the tree, or is it the result of influence by society? You are now aware that you are building the wall. Having built and being caught in the process of building the wall, your intelligence says that you should be rid of this wall. To get rid of this wall, you must first find out why you are building the wall. If you understand the truth of this, you do not have to 'struggle not

to protect you inwardly. You can use property as a means of psychological protection. Property in itself is just a piece of land which can give you food ; you give that property a significance which it has not, and with that significance you protect yourself.

So, the trouble does not lie in outward things which are all made by the hand or by the mind. The trouble is because you use those things as a means of self-protection ; and therefore, you give to them values which they do not possess and, with those values, you are inwardly protecting yourself. The fact is that those values in themselves are non-existent but are merely created by your mind. Therefore, the outward things made by the hand and beliefs made by the mind become extraordinarily important and you cling to them both because, with the values you give them, you protect yourself psychologically. What an extraordinary transformation you have made in yourself ! Things made by the mind are illusory because they, beliefs, can project themselves into visions and experiences—you believe or you like to believe in the Master, and you can experience the Master. It is very simple ; you want to see a vision and you see a vision, pleasant or unpleasant. It is all the projection of the mind.

So, you have discovered from this process that, through sensory perceptions, you are protecting something which is not sensory, something which you do not know.

What are you protecting behind your enclosing wall ? Protecting implies that there is something which can be protected. In other words, what is that something which you are trying to protect by your values with regard to things made by the hand or by the mind ? Is there anything behind the wall ? You are building an erection of valuations ; what is behind that wall of valuations ?

To enquire if there is anything behind the wall, what is the instrument with which you are enquiring ? The instrument is the outcome of the things made by the hand or by the mind, which is the wall. To find out what is behind the wall, you have to climb over the wall or to go through the wall.

What are you protecting with extraordinary care everyday, struggling, cheating ruthlessly, brutally, violently, deceitfully and cunningly ? When you say you are protecting your-

self, you are merely protecting the wall which you have built up. So, your consideration is how to strengthen the wall and not to protect something. To find out what is behind the wall, the wall must cease. You do not know what is behind the wall and therefore you are not protecting the thing behind the wall, but only the wall which you know, which is your valuation. The positive value is the wall; you do not like that and you would like to be something else.

When you are talking about protecting you do not know what you are protecting. But, you do know that the wall exists. So, perhaps you are protecting the wall, because the value is the wall, either positive value or negative value. So, you are keeping a wall, positively or negatively, as a means of protecting; and on enquiring what you are protecting, you do not know. You see the wall only and not the something behind it. Perhaps, if you know what is inside the enclosure, it may not be necessary to protect at all; or, perhaps there is nothing to protect.

Without knowing what is behind the wall, it is absurd your protecting or building a wall. You only know the wall. You do not know anything about protection. Therefore, the word 'protection' has gone out of your thought, and all that remains is the wall, not the idea to protect something. You are not using the word 'protection' any more, because 'to protect' means 'to protect something'; and as you do not know that something, you are not going to protect. All that you are now left with, is the wall and not 'protection'. But, the wall is made of the valuation by the valuer. So, the wall is the valuer and the valuation.

You are protecting something which you do not know. If you know what you are protecting, that may not need any protection. So, it is a foolish action that you are doing. Therefore, you will neither protect nor destroy; and you are only left with the wall and not with the idea of protection. The wall was created out of things made by the mind; therefore, the mind is the wall. The wall is made out of the mind's tricks and valuations. As the mind is the creator of the values, the values are the mind.

What is 'me'? 'Me' is the product of desire in relation to the object of desire. A challenge and the response to the challenge constitute an experience. When the response is con-

ditioned, the experience leaves a residue which is memory. 'Me' is 'memories', the accumulated residue of experiences, with which evaluation is made, the sum total of the qualities. So, the 'me' which is protecting the wall, is the wall. i.e., the qualifier evaluating things is the wall. Therefore, the wall is the 'me', the thinker, the thought, the valuation.

The "me", the accumulated residue of experience, is pleasurable in part and painful. The thinker wants to avoid the painful; he finds the thoughts can be changed. So, hoping to be permanent and unchanging, he separates himself from the thoughts and talks of "I change my thoughts", thus playing a trick on himself, because the separation is not real but only fictitious. When attacked, the thinker tries to seek identification with "higher self", and when that is attacked, he identifies himself with Atman, with Paramatman, then with Para Brahman. Thus, the thinker is always trying to do something about thought.

Unfortunately, all your structure of thinking, your philosophy, is based on this fallacy that the thinker is different from the thought. Therefore, you have all kinds of systems for reformation of thought, etc., which are doing such havoc in the world now.

So, there is the wall, which is the 'me', the thinker, the thought, the valuation. The 'me' which is the quality, which is the wall, is enquiring to find out what is behind. That is, the 'me' which is the valuation, is enquiring the valueless which the 'me' does not know. That is, the 'me' which is the judge, is judging something which it does not know; therefore, it can never judge. It can only judge according to the values which it has; but something which it does not know, it cannot judge. So, the 'me' is only protecting itself, though it talks of protecting something unknown to it. The 'me' that is protecting itself, is still an idea which has no substance. It is going round in circles and it is concerned in maintaining the wall and not in relating with another. Therefore as long as the wall exists, there is no relationship.

As long as the wall exists, you have no relationship with your wife or with the society. As long as the wall exists, you cannot find what is behind. So, your problem is how to dissolve the wall. In trying to understand that problem, you understand this extraordinary process how the thinker and

the thought have separated themselves thus creating all the mess in the world. You realise that you cannot do anything about the wall because you are the wall and because whatever you do only helps in still building the wall. Therefore you cannot do anything, which means, the wall ceases to be. As long as you are acting, doing something negatively or positively, you are adding to the wall because you are the wall. Therefore you cannot do anything about the wall. When you cannot do anything, actually you sit quiet, therefore, the wall is not. There is no "overcoming" the wall, no "demolishing" the wall.

Thus, when you are aware, through understanding the truth about the wall, the wall ceases to be and there is no barrier. Then, there is love. You love all, irrespective of whether they have their own enclosures or not.

So, please start with yourself, recognize you are building a wall around you and yet trying to have relationship with others; understand and be aware of what is taking place in this process; then, the wall around you will cease to be and you will build no more walls, then only can you love others and have real relationship with them.

"related" or whether merely 'relationship' is a term without much significance. We started with the examination of "relationship" as it is now and not of what it should be. We found that relationship is conflict though that conflict is neither necessary nor inevitable. We also found that this conflict in relationship was due to each one striving for isolation; though you may live with your wife, with your neighbour and with the society, you are really building psychological walls of isolation between yourself and society, between yourself and your family. Though you say you are "related" to your wife and your children, what is actually taking place in "relationship" is that you are seeking self-protection by building up walls of resistance, and so is your wife and others. You occasionally look over the walls and call it relationship; but, the isolating walls keep you separate. Is the building of the wall an inevitable law like gravitation? You build the wall to protect yourself. On enquiry, you found that though, physically and biologically, some property—food, clothes and shelter—is essential for your existence, it is not necessary to protect yourself psychologically. Yet you are protecting yourself inwardly by the values which you have given yourself to the things made by the hand (property) or by the mind (beliefs), thus using for your psychological protection only values based on sensory perception. Because of this, things assume an importance or significance which they do not inherently possess, and you, therefore, cling tenaciously to property and belief, even to the extent of dying for them, if necessary. The walls which you protect yourself with, are built up of the values which you yourself have given to things.

Are you aware that you are creating this wall of detachment around you? You have a certain attitude and I may or may not have that attitude; the very attitude of the teacher and the disciple builds a wall. Similarly, a man of property, a man of possession, or a man of greed, creates a barrier between himself and his servants, between himself and the man who has no title; the man who has title, talks about brotherhood and about avoiding distinctions and so on; yet, he creates a barrier between himself and others. The building of these psychological walls is the very impediment to relationship and is one of the fundamental disintegrating factors in society.

One of these isolating walls around you is caste. Your father or his forbears created caste to separate themselves from the rest; probably, biologically, they thought they were superior and did not want to mix up with the rest. We can understand this tendency, because each one of us wants to feel superior. You put degrees after your name to show that you are different from another. You have the desire to be separate, to be superior to others, to be something in words and in name; that is why you are attached to your titles, your property, your name, etc. If all these are taken away from you, you are absolutely nothing. Similarly, your national prejudice is another such wall. As you are inwardly poor, shallow and empty, you seek gratification through things by giving them your own extraordinary values, and you therefore cling to them with great tenacity; you therefore build the wall around you and within the enclosure you admit none, not even your son, your neighbour, or the society. In understanding this, you understand that the search for sensory gratification is the cause of creating the enclosing wall.

Desire is the builder of the wall—desire for title, for bank account, for property, for family, for beliefs. The 'I' is the product of the desire in relation to an object. How does desire come into being? Perception, contact, sensation and desire. There is a car, then perception of it, then contact with it, then a sensation caused by it, and then the desire which says "How lovely it is! I would like to have it", comes. Desire or craving comes through seeing, touching and feeling. It is the outcome of sensate values, the identification through the senses with the object of the senses. Desire with regard to ideas also follows the same process. You like, or you do not like, a particular idea. When you like an idea, that idea is pleasing and gratifying to you. The acceptance of an idea or the rejection of an idea is based merely on gratification which is sensate. So, the sensory values dominate and the sensory value is the 'me' dominating the whole—'I and my property', 'I and my relationship', or 'I and my belief.' Belief is the outcome of the projection of the mind, whether it is the belief in the ultimate Paramatman or Brahman, or in the Higher Self and the Lower Self. When you think about the Atman, it is still thought. The Brahman is still thought. As your belief in Reality, God, Atman, etc.,

is self-projected, it is sensory. Therefore, 'your God' is also sensate; 'your God' is created by you. The implications are tremendous if you admit this; it will mean, as far as you are concerned, the whole collapse of the so-called religious society.

So, you see that desire is the outcome of the sensate value; 'me' is the result of desire; 'me' creates, formulates, and fabricates values, etc.; the wall that 'me' builds is also of sensate values created by the builder; and that whatever the thinker, the actor, the builder, does is always *sensory* and, therefore, transitory.

You now understand how, because your values with regard to property, to relationship and to ideation are all sensory, there is conflict within yourself and chaos in the society around you which is an expression of your inner conflict. You see that your neighbour is like you in many ways and both of you have only sensate values, though you may talk of the Absolute, the Supreme, the Ideal, etc. The result is conflict between you and your neighbour which is society. That is the building of the walls that separate you and your neighbour, your sensory values and your neighbour's sensory values. So, there is no relationship between you and your neighbour; and, therefore, there is no relationship between you and society. The society is not responsible for you. It passes laws but you are out of it. You fit in when it suits you; and when it does not suit you, you are out of it. Similarly, society uses you as a part of itself when it suits it; it absorbs you as a soldier when there is a war, and thrusts you into it, and you accept it. Thus, there is mutual exploitation.

You know now, how conflict arises by your building your wall of sensate values. You also know that the builder of the wall is the 'I' which is itself the outcome of desire. As long as the 'I' is satisfied with the wall, there is nothing and the 'I' feels absolutely safe inside the wall. Most of you are in this state and you crave to remain undisturbed, each behind his own wall. Therefore, in your present state of psychological enclosure behind the wall of your sensate values, your talk of brotherhood has no meaning whatsoever.

Your cravings, your desires, inevitably cause you suffering. When you suffer, you feel disturbed. There is a breach in the wall, there is an enquiry, there is a storm. When you suffer, you try to forget and to avoid that very suffering by building

another wall, a wall of belief, or the religious book or the temple, or the Master or some other means of escape. What happens when the 'thinker' is avoiding pain? The 'thinker' does not want to feel pain or to be disturbed. He hopes to be the permanent and enduring entity behind the wall and, therefore, he separates himself from the wall, i.e., from the thought, i.e., from the desire. He then attempts to change his desires and his thoughts; he desires a house, he desires a quality, and ultimately he desires God. Objects of desire can be changed and the thinker is behind the wall feeling he is always permanent. The 'thinker' and the 'thought' are now two different things because the 'me', i.e., the thinker, is the permanent entity, the other is impermanent; the 'me' is secure, the other is insecure, and the 'me' can play with the secure as much as it likes. If the thinker identifies himself with the 'thought', then, in changing the thought, he becomes impermanent—which he does not like. Therefore, the 'thought' is considered as separate from the 'I', when the 'I' is attacked a little more, the 'I' divides itself into the higher and lower, and when the higher is attacked, the 'I' retreats further high and becomes the Paramatman. There is always in the 'thinker' a sense of permanency, a sense of continuity.

This is what is happening in daily life. When your property is taken away, you retreat to some other permanency to relationship; and when that goes, you turn to something else, a little higher, and so on, you always remaining, and the objects being higher and higher—which is your relationship to God or 'I am God'. The discussion which we have had so far, has revealed to you the process of your thinking so that, without deception, you can see what you think and how you act in relation to property, in relation to your wife and in relation to society. All these three are sought by you in order to safeguard yourself. Because you think you are separate from your thoughts and desires, you are all the time seeking permanency by changing your thoughts and your desires through legislation, through practices, through discipline, through systems and so on. But as has been stated already, whatever you, 'the thinker', may do, it is always sensory and therefore impermanent.

You now realise that neither legislation nor belief nor discipline will alter the 'me'. According to environmental

influences, the 'me' can change the thought, can become communist when it suits 'me,' or a capitalist, or a socialist, or a religious person. Thus, unless the 'me' who is the mischief-maker is tackled and transformed, the 'me' will always create havoc in relationship with property, with family, and with ideas. The transformation of the 'thinker' will be radical, and not merely superficial, only when the separation of the thinker from the thought ceases.

You suggest that the thinker and the thought are now separate and they should be brought together. This suggestion is wrong because it is based on a non-reality. The 'I' is not actually separate from the thought. It was a clever trick on the part of the 'I' to separate from the thought which is impermanent, assuming its own permanency. This is fictitious. The moment the 'I' realises that it has played the trick on itself, the trick is gone and the thinker is the thought.

To sum up, the 'I' is made up of many memories. The memories are the result of desire; the desire is the result of perception, contact, sensation, identification, which is the 'me'. So, the 'I' which is the product of desire, cleverly separates himself from the desire and does something about it, because, he can always change desires, and yet he can remain permanent. That is a clever trick that he is playing upon himself with a view to entrenching himself in continuity. This is the cause of the inner conflict in each individual and of the chaos which exists in the world at present; this state of affairs will continue till the trick is gone. The 'I' does not see the falseness of the trick which he has played upon himself, because when he realises the falseness of the trick, he will come into conflict with everybody.

Most of you agree with what we have discussed so far in regard to the falseness of the trick played by the mind on itself; yet you have not seen the real depth of this problem and, therefore, it has not brought about clarification and transformation in you. You accept this in your superficial consciousness but the deeper layers of consciousness are putting up a tremendous inward resistance to this acceptance. Is this because you are isolated or sleepy? You are not isolated and sleepy but very awake with regard to things that matter—money, passion, enjoyment and so on. You have deliberately

become sleepy to things which are disturbing to you, or which you do not want. This means that you are awake in one part to things you like and asleep in another part to things you do not like. All the present conflict is the result of this partial awakening. Because one part of you is isolated and the other part is active, there is chaos created in yourself and this chaos is projected outside. This is the major portion of your existence. Nothing distracts you from the pursuit of pleasure; but whenever you apprehend any shock or suffering you promptly try your best deliberately to shut it off from you and to avoid it. That is why you do not look at this problem seriously though you verbally agree. Who is going to make you look? Can legislation, government, education, the ideal, or any other outside agency make you look? Therefore, *suffering comes to you as a warning*. But every time you have suffering and sorrow, you look on it as a disturbance and try to avoid it so as to continue in the same old state; this sort of action on the part of the mind has made your life one series of conflicts to avoid "what is". To be aware of how the mind is playing the trick upon itself, is the beginning of understanding. The moment you are aware of it, you invite trouble—and there is joy.

27-12-1947

These discussions are really meant to be a means of self-knowledge, to discover ourselves as we are talking—not afterwards but as we go along step by step—and to experience directly what is being said, so that we could relate what we are talking to our daily life.

We were discussing the idea of separating ourselves in our relationship, how we are building walls of isolation and thinking we are "related" to each other; how the sensate values become predominant when money, property, things are used as a means of isolation; how in relationship between you and another—which relationship creates the society—there is conflict; that this constant battle between you and me and between you and society is due to our merely looking at each other over the walls of isolation, which we have deliberately

built in order to isolate ourselves as much as we can ; that this isolation is a form of self-protection, and that these walls are built by the "me", the thinker who is not really different from the thought, though we have taken it for granted that thought is separate and that the thinker remains aloof and transforms thought.

We also discussed why we do not see the depth of such a serious problem as the thinker and the thought are one, whether it is because we are asleep, or because we don't want to go deeply into the matter, as, if we do, it will mean a revolution in thinking and therefore in action. If the thinker and the thought are one, the thinker has to alter himself fundamentally, and not merely the frame of his picture which is thinking. So, the thinker plays an insidious and clever trick on himself and separates himself from the thought and then does something about thought.

To discuss this, you must find out what desire is and how desire or craving arises. Desire comes through perception, contact, sensation and identification. So there is the "me," the person who chooses. The 'me,' the thinker, is born out of desire, and he does not exist previous to desire. In your everyday experience, the thinker is separate from the thought, i.e., the thought is outside you as it were, and you can do something about it, you can modify it and recondition it. Is the thinker really separate from the thought ?

How does the "thinker" come into being ? You are the result of your father and mother. How did you begin to think and feel as a child ? You wanted milk, there was a sensation of hunger ; then the contact with the bottle or the breast, and the struggle to feed, to grow, and then the toy, the impingement of society on the mind ; and gradually, the 'I' comes out. Therefore, it is perception, sensation, contact and the desire from which is 'my mother,' 'my toy,' which grows to 'my bank account', 'my house', and so on. So the thinker, the 'me', comes through perception, contact, sensation and desire from which arises consciousness ; the thinker, then separates himself, for his own further security, as the high and the low, the high becoming the Paramatman and the low becoming this existence. When this existence

is threatened, the thinker can always retire into the more permanent.

You are the sum-total of all the human existence. As you are a Hindu, you are the result of all Hindus; you are the result of your father, not only biologically, but in thought, in your beliefs, and so on. The 'I' comes into being through desire; then the 'I' feels established and creates the desire which is outward, the desire and 'I' thus becoming two separate entities, which means that the thinker and the thought are separate. Craving continuity, the thinker separates himself from the thought, and thinks that thought is changeable, modifiable, can be destroyed and replaced. If the thinker is the thought, then the thinker also can be changed, which means he has to admit his impermanency—which he does not like. All our actions in society are based on the idea that the 'I' is the permanent and the thought is the impermanent. We know very well the impermanency of matter. Property can be taken away from you when Communism comes, or when you lose it by speculation. Because thought is seeking permanency, it says "I will go to a higher level of consciousness or a deeper level which is my belief, which is my God", and goes higher and higher to be more and more permanent. When this trick is understood, it is gone, and the thinker and the thought are one. Then, there will be a revolution in our daily life.

You admit that the thinker and the thought are one and yet there is no change in your way of living. Why? Either you are asleep which means you don't want to be disturbed, or there is an inward resistance. Now, how can we dissolve the resistance? Not by overcoming it, not by disciplining it away, but by understanding it. The moment you understand it, it drops away. What do you mean by resistance? You accept the idea on the superficial layer of your consciousness and the rest of your consciousness is resisting it. You are resisting any change. That is, you are resisting the acceptance of 'what is'; 'what is' is that the thinker and the thought are one. You superficially say 'Yes', but the rest of your consciousness is resisting it, because the unconscious sees the tremendous implications in the acceptance of 'what is'. You are afraid to lose yourself—yourself meaning your property, your status now, your belief and your son. So you are

resisting in order not to lose what you are protecting, in order to guard it. This means you are resisting the destruction of ideas, relationship and things made by the hand or by the mind: you are resisting the dissolution of the identification with things, with name, with property, and so on. The house, the property, is the value which the mind gives; otherwise the house has no meaning; and things made by the mind are also the values given by the mind. You are afraid that, by not identifying with the valuations of the mind, there will be an end; and so, you are resisting their end or destruction.

You are defending the valuations which you have created, lest they should be destroyed; the valuations are created through desires, which is the mind. So, you are resisting the destruction of valuations which have come into being through thought, the thought being the result of the desire—i.e., the desire creates the thinker, the thinker evaluates and then offers resistance to the destruction of those things which he has built up. So, the thinker is resisting 'what is' and the impingement of new desires. The values are created by the mind whether of things or of ideas. So, it is afraid to lose the valuation which it has created and to which it is attached. You bring a new idea and the mind does not want to have it because it is disturbing the things which it has already built.

The thinker is resisting, not with things, but with ideas which are transitory in themselves. So, your resistance is transitory. You are resisting the dissolution of valuations which are thoughts and thought is transitory. Things have no significance except what the mind gives; in their very nature they are transitory; and yet the mind clings to them and to the significance it gives them. In other words, the thinker creates evaluations and then, in examining them, finds that these evaluations are transitory, and that he is resisting the destruction of the transitory because he is seeking permanency in them. In other words, you recognize that they are all impermanent and yet you are seeking permanency in them because, by your valuation, you have given them permanency. When you recognize the absurdity of giving permanency to things which have no permanency, it drops away—just as when you know that all the banks are bad, you don't go to any bank. All things made by the hand or by the

Mind are in their very nature transitory because the mind alone gives values to them, transitory for the simple reason that thought is transitory and thought is the thinker. Now, you, the thinker, are asking, "Is there permanency?" because it is what you want. You are the result of desire which is impermanent. The impermanent is asking to find out the truth of permanency. The mind which has been seeking permanency has vested permanency in things made by the hand or by the mind, and it finds that they are impermanent; and yet, it says it must have permanency.

Can the impermanent find the permanent? If I am blind can I see light? If I am ignorant can I know enlightenment? There can only be enlightenment when ignorance ceases. The transitory cannot find the permanent; it must cease for the permanent to be. The person who is seeking permanency is obviously impermanent; you cannot say he is permanent. He is the outcome of transitory desire and therefore, in himself, he is transitory—which he does not acknowledge.

Property is impermanent. Relationship is impermanent. Belief is impermanent. Therefore, seeing everything around as impermanent and as transitory, the mind says that there must be something permanent, though there is no inherent permanency. Your permanency is born out of impermanency and is therefore the opposite of impermanency, therefore, it has the seed of its opposite which is transitory. When you treat impermanency as impermanent, then there is nothing, but, when you are seeking permanency as an opposite to transitory, that permanency itself is transitory. So, you are resisting the acknowledgment of the fact that whatever you do, think and feel is impermanent, though you know very well that they are impermanent. This is another trick of the mind. So, you recognize the trick that the mind is seeking permanency in opposition to the transitory—namely, that whatever you do is impermanent; and yet you are seeking permanency. Being transitory yourself, you can never find permanency, because you will evaluate "permanency" and all your valuations are transitory. The impermanent can never find the permanent.

When you realise this, you do not seek permanency through things, through relationship and through ideas. Therefore, there is no valuation and you accept them at their

level. Therefore you have no conflict with them. There is a great relief if the mind is not giving values of permanency to things which have no permanency. If you say property, family and things are necessary but not as a means for permanency, then there is no conflict. It does not matter who owns the house; you use it merely as a means of protection, and not as a means of self-expansion through the search for permanency. Therefore, the mind, the 'thinker' as the 'evaluator', is non-existent. When the thinker ceases to create value, perhaps something else will come into being. But, as long as the thinker exists there must be the evaluation. His values are impermanent. Therefore, if the thinker is seeking permanency, he must cease, because he is the mischief-maker and is reducing to chaos the relationship with society and with property. So, your problem then is how the thinker can come to an end, how the thinking process can end.

Someone says that there will be no progress at all if the thinker ceases to exist. The word "progress" was first introduced by the industrialists in the eighteenth century in England because they wanted to make the people buy more. Progress means time. Through time, do you understand anything? You can only understand now, not to-morrow. Therefore, understanding is independent of time. So, how is the thinker to come to an end? If he does, life becomes extraordinarily marvellous and there is no conflict with things. As the thinker is the result of desire, this means that desires must come to an end. Can desire come to an end? What do you mean by desire? Perception, contact, sensation and desire. "I must have" food, "I must have" clothes, "I must have" shelter. Those are imperative 'musts'; though there are certain desires involved in them, they are necessary. But the desire or the craving for things, for family, for name, for belief, must cease. If it ceases, what will happen to my relationship? Desire is the very expression of attachment. When I use my wife as a means of psychological necessity, then there is attachment; when she helps me to cover up my loneliness, then I am attached. Then, she is mine. Similarly, belief becomes necessary when I am attached to it, whether it is belief in religion, or belief in an economic system. So, desire can come to an end only when there is

no attachment. And can I live in the world without attachment? Obviously I can. The moment I am attached it is an indication of desire—desire which is impermanent and which creates the thinker who evaluates. It is only when it ends, that you can find out if there is permanency or not. Without that, any talk of belief is puerile. I have shown you how to stop thinking. If thinking ceases, then there would be a great quickening, and a revolution would take place inside you.

30—12—1947

To love another is one of the most difficult things, because there is in it always the shadow of pleasure and pain. In it there is always the sensual memory with its incessant gnawing either of yesterday's picture or of to-morrow's delight. There is always a sense of frustration, a sense of unpleasant existence; there is never a moment of complete love, of complete communion with another. Have you ever felt this sense of an extraordinary physical resistance as well as psychological impediment in loving another, when there is really no openness between two people? Surely, there can be only love when there is this sense of complete communion with another.

There is no way to love. You cannot buy it, nor can you barter it away for something else; love must be really felt and lived, and it comes into being when this pleasure and pain, when this sense of frustration, when this sense of demanding fulfilment in another, when this sense of the "me" and "my pleasures" ceases; and that is one of the most difficult and arduous things. We can be sentimental over love; but, that is not love. In loving one, you will love the whole humanity. *The idea of loving everybody has very little meaning if you don't know how to love one, your child, your husband, your wife, or your neighbour. After all, the one is the whole.*

The idea of cosmic love and loving mankind is really a rationalization of the lack of love in one's heart for another. It is an easy escape of the reformer, of the humanist, of the

moralist and of the righteous. Our trouble is that we really do not know how to love another.

We know when we love somebody with all our being. It is surely a shattering experience because it implies a letting down of all barriers.

It is worthwhile discussing the problem of duality, in which is implied pleasure and pain, resistance and non-resistance, merit and demerit, the desire for fulfilment, the desire to have an example or an ideal, the desire to imitate, the problem of resistance, meditation, etc. Is there the opposite? Are we aware of the opposites and when?

When you crave for something, there is always resistance. In gaining it, you must resist other encroachments and other influences. You must build around you a wall in order to gain what you want. Others also may want the same thing; and so, you must resist them. So, in craving for something, there must be resistance.

You desire power. In setting out to achieve power, you desire to acquire position, prestige and all the implications of power. In this craving for achievement, there is inherently the state of 'not-achieving' and the fear of 'not achieving'; this means resistance. Thus, every craving for something creates its own opposite, its own resistance.

Let us take attachment and detachment. Being attached, you find pain and strife in attachment; and in order to overcome that pain and strife, you say 'I must be detached'. It is really the pain that comes out of attachment that you want to get rid of; only, you call it detachment. But, you never question why you are attached. If you understood what attachment is, then you would not proceed to detachment. Attachment may be the outcome of frustration. You are attached to your house, name, wife. Inwardly, you are frustrated, you are not fulfilling, you are not complete. Therefore, the house, the family and the name become all important, to which you become attached; and when they cause you pain, you wish to 'develop detachment'. But still, the inward frustration, emptiness, poverty, continues. We treat detachment and attachment as opposites, because we do not really understand the process of detachment.

You have to understand what is implied in being held to something. In the very desire to achieve anything, there is

the seed of its own opposite. In the process of 'becoming', achieving, gaining, there is always the 'conflict of the opposites', because the very desire to 'become something' creates its own opposite.

In 'becoming' there is always the dual, in 'being' there is no duality. When you are angry, there is no duality at the moment of anger, i.e., you are in the state of 'being angry.' But that 'being angry' creates a disturbance and you don't want to be angry; so, you want to 'become peaceful'; this 'becoming' implies the dual. There is no duality in that particular moment when the feeling arises; duality is only found after that feeling has been termed; there is the time-factor involved in it. If there is no 'becoming', there is no duality with all its conflict, the time-factor, the whole sense of frustration and all the rest of it.

For example, you are angry; you find anger painful, you think there will be pleasure in 'non-anger', thus, you have immediately created duality, you refuse to understand the full significance of anger, but you pursue its opposite; you want to transform 'anger' into 'non-anger'. Thus, 'becoming' implies a refusal to acknowledge 'what is' and a desire to transform 'what is' into other than 'what is'.

The pursuit of an ideal also implies the 'conflict of opposites'. The ideal is something which you are not. You are this and you want to 'become' that which is your ideal. To understand the implications of what you actually are now, your mind must be free and concentrated, but, if your mind is thinking in terms of the ideal, then it is distracted by the ideal. What are the implications of 'becoming the ideal'? The ideal is the example to be followed, and 'becoming' the ideal means imitation. Supposing you are arrogant, your ideal is humility. The ideal is created by your not understanding 'arrogance' which is the 'what is'. Humility is the example which you are going to become. The example means imitation. So, in becoming, in achieving the ideal, there is copying—which means only imitation and no thinking. When you have an ideal there cannot be thinking; there is merely the achievement of 'becoming that ideal'. In your daily life, you are full of ideals; which means you are not thinking but merely imitating.

In 'becoming', there is imitation, copying, and therefore the cessation of thinking, feeling, living; and therefore, the idealists are the most thoughtless, brutal and ruthless people; and to them systems are more important than man. Hitler was said to be a great idealist. In yourself, you can see the truth of this when you pursue an ideal. You have the ideal of Brahmacharya; then, you just leave your wife and go. When you have an ideal of a perfect state, the proletariat or the right, you see how ruthless you are bound to be in achieving that ideal. The ideal, the example, is the authority, whether it is imposed by another or by yourself inwardly, therefore, there is cessation of thinking and there is fear.

All your social structure, all your education, and all your relationship are based on imitation. Your judgment and your thought is based on avoiding 'what is'. Look at what is happening in society. Corruption, degradation and so on. Why do you not tackle all this directly, instead of saying that through an ideal you must become marvellous?

It is the thoughtless man who is asleep and who is imitative, that wants an ideal, because he has to whip himself up to become something. But the man who is learning, watching and feeling things, does not require an ideal; he is active where he is. So, in 'becoming' there is the denial of 'what is', the denial of what you are, i.e., your 'being arrogant'. And in 'becoming humble', which is the ideal, you must find out how to become that. "How" is the imitative process. You go to a Guru for help, in which there is implied authority and fear. So, 'becoming' implies imitation and therefore no creativeness at all. Look at the society, look at us, how thoughtless we are! We are marvellous in passing examinations and nothing else. A man who is 'becoming', can never find Reality because he is not understanding 'what is', but wants to transform 'what is'. Why should any man 'become the ideal' when he is what he is? By understanding 'what is'; perhaps a new thing will come into being.

So, an ideal is really an impediment; the example is a horror to a creative man. When you want to write a poem and when you are imitating Keats, you cease to be a poet. But, when you are really creative and you really want to write a poem, you don't care two pins about Keats as the ideal. That is why you need revolution of a fundamental,

deep and psychological nature to free you from imitation, from the ideal; because it is only when you are free, you can be creative. When you are aware of the implications of 'becoming' which creates the ideal and which creates the example, it drops away. This means facing 'what is', and living very dangerously, sailing in uncharted seas, and being very alert and awake all the time.

You say that others will exploit you. If you are intelligent, you are not exploited by others, nor do you want to exploit others. You cannot be exploited by another unless you both belong to the same club.

There is, at present, chaos in most of the countries and a revolution is taking place—economic, social, as well as religious. This revolution is thoughtless and mostly chaotic. Why not acknowledge this? At least those people who are intelligent can really think it all out and deliberately bring about the necessary revolution and thus lay the foundations for a new culture. A house that is crumbling must be pulled down before you build; in the process of pulling down, it looks rather chaotic, and people who look at it from outside may say that it is chaotic; but, the man who is pulling it down is not affected by it, because he knows what he is going to build.

If you are concerned with the ideal that humanity must be fed and therefore a system must be found to feed them, the common man will go hungry, and that is the case with the idealists, whether the extreme Leftist or the Rightist, because system becomes very important. So, there is the obvious creation through false thinking, through ignorance, through wrong thinking, that the opposite, the 'becoming', is going to alter 'what is' and, on that, so many philosophies are founded. You are not concerned in becoming humble; it is futile, it is only one of the tricks of the mind. After all arrogance is the fact. You are arrogant, what is the cause? First of all, why do you name it? Why do you term as arrogance the feeling which you have?

You give a name to a feeling that arises in you in response to a challenge, in order to bring it within the frame of references, which is memory. The feeling is new and you absorb that into the old; by giving it a name, you strengthen the old. But if you do not absorb it into the framework of

references and do not give it a name, the feeling withers away. Further, the feeling is always the new, though it is out of an old conditioning; if you treat it as new, then you will understand the old.

When you are arrogant, arrogance is the effect, and not the cause; it may be the cause a little later. You feel superior and call yourself a name, because you feel a sense of inferiority and you want to become superior. The superiority is the ideal which you want to become and therefore you create the framework of imitation and therefore thoughtlessness, and deny 'what is' which is your being inferior. You feel inferior in relationship to something. You want to be something because the whole society in which you live, is based on 'becoming' something. And as long as you are 'becoming', you must be inferior. There is always the 'you' a little bigger than 'what is'. If you think you are nobody and if you accept that, you may not strive to 'become' somebody, because that is too silly. So, you don't "become"; you accept that you are nothing. Do you know what it means? When you accept that you are nothing, it is really wonderful. Then, you know what it means to love; then, you are willing to cry with somebody.

The man who is something and who wants to 'become the ideal' of loving, and does not know 'what is', is merely thinking in terms of 'becoming' something. He has the ideal, the authority, the fear, the example; and he gets lost in that.

The fact is that you are nobody. Why not start from there and face facts directly without trying to become 'somebody'? To face your nothingness means to be humble and to love; it means, you have no resistance to any one, no barrier between you and the person whom you despise and who has no ideal.

A person who is arrogant can never find humility however hard he may try to 'become' humble. A person who does not recognize his nothingness but pursues ideals is like a man who, without ever knowing how to sow, ploughs and ploughs and never sows. Behind all your knowledge, all your degrees, titles and possessions, there is nothing. When you really acknowledge that you are nothing, you are everything because you know what love is.

You ask me if there is free choice in the opposite. How can there be free choice? You choose only by comparison, when you have two things; and your choice is based on either pleasure or pain. It means memory which is the accumulation of experience. So, you really are not choosing. There are two things, memory and response; and there is no choice. You may say that you have listened to the dictates of memory.

You want to know 'how to love'. If love is the opposite of hate, ill-will, it is no longer love; love is the ideal which implies imitation; and the man who imitates, cannot know love. A man who is seeking how to love, does not know love. He may seek methods as he has the ideal of love; but, he is not loving. He does not want to acknowledge his lack of love, and he says that he has the ideal to become loving, thus deceiving himself and cheating others. "How to love" implies duality, and in the very 'becoming' there is a conflict of the opposites. If he understands the whole significance of the 'becoming', it drops away, and he is faced with 'what is'. 'What is' is the most marvellous thing; it is the only true thing: everything else is not. When he faces 'what is'—i.e., he is lacking in love—and goes deeper and deeper into it, he finds that he is nothing though he has a mask, though he is talking about God, and that behind all verbal things intellectually produced there is absolutely nothing. This feeling of nothingness is not the end, it is only the beginning of liberation; your activity will be immediate and very clarifying.

You ask me how you can feel as 'nothing' when you are constantly reminded by others that you are something. You are known to be something, as a house-agent, as a black marketeer, or as a religious man worshipping God. Psychologically, you are reminded by others that you are something. You, by yourself, feel and acknowledge that you are nothing; but, society and your friends say that you are something. Either you should be 'nobody' or 'somebody'. If you acknowledge that you are nothing, no amount of your friends telling you that you are a great man is going to make you believe you are a great man. But, when you play with them in the same market, then they will have to remind you, then you will accept them. That is, if you think that you are somewhat great, then their telling you that you are a great man means a lot to you.

You want to know what will happen if you feel you are 'nothing' but you are married and have relationships. There is your responsibility to the family; it means immediate communion between you and your wife. She may refuse your communion because you are nothing and she wants to be something. Because you are open completely and your wife is not, there is a friction between you and her, not on your part but on her part, because she is something and you are not. You love and you don't ask anything. You really love your wife or your neighbour, or your husband, because you are open. They may be closed and they may create trouble. You become more and more silent, and more and more loving. They may get more and more irritated; but you are not irritated. In other words, relationship becomes extremely difficult. The moment you are very earnest in acknowledging your nothingness, you are going to have difficulties between you and another, between you and society.

Your problem is to be that which you are. If you are stupid, cunning, black-marketing, be that. Be aware of it.* That is all that matters. If you are a liar be aware that you are a liar; then, you will cease to lie. To acknowledge and to live with 'what is' is the most difficult thing. Out of that, comes real Love, because that sweeps away all hypocrisy. Try it in your social life; be what you are, whatever it is; and be aware of that. You will see an extraordinary transformation taking place immediately. And from that, there is freedom because, *when you are nothing, you do not demand anything. That is liberation.* Because you are nothing and you are free, there is real opening and no barrier between you and another. Though you are married and though you love one, there is no enclosure. If you love one completely, you love the whole because one is the whole.

You want to know what will happen when you feel that you are 'the whole'. Feeling as 'the whole' comes perhaps later. But first, you are nothing and you are not concerned with what comes after. If you are concerned with what is beyond the nothingness, it means you are frightened of being nothing. 'Be nothing'. Life then becomes extraordinarily simple and beautiful. Being nothing, i.e., acknowledging 'what is', is one of the most difficult tasks because mind does not like it, because it is afraid of being nothing, i.e., of having

no security. But the moment you 'are nothing', you love; till then, you do not know what it means to love; till then, you have the resistance of responsibility, of duty and marrying off. If you love your wife really, you will love your children. Then you would see how they are to be taught and by whom they are to be taught. Because you love them, you want to see that they are the best human beings, not that you would compel them to any ideal. You do not realise what a revolution this will produce.

You want to know if this revolution would be reciprocated. You are not concerned with others at all. If you recognize 'what is' and live with it, you will see a revolution produced in you and therefore in the family and in the world. Surely, that is the most practical way of living. Out of that comes creativeness; because when you accept 'what is'—i.e., in accepting what you are—you are free. Then you begin to create. Then there is Reality, God, or what you like to call it. 'All ideals are foolery and without much significance for a thoughtful man. When you set all ideals aside and face 'what is', then you will find a beautiful and really indescribable love that is not yours and mine, but a thing that is self-created and which is its own eternity.

The following notes relate to the discussions which some persons had with J. Krishnamurti during afternoons, chiefly as a result of the discussions they had in the morning meetings.

17-11-1947

My purpose in discussing various subjects with you is to awaken intelligence in you so that at least some could understand the end-purpose of life and who would devote their lives to seek Reality and keep the flame bright even in my absence.

You say that, so far, none of those who have discussed with me, has given up things like motor cars or Bank balances, and that a start should be made now by giving up at least really unimportant things like the motor car, so that step by step you would be able to overcome greed. It is not 'practice' or 'progress step by step', which will lead to the cessation of greed. Mortification of the flesh will not lead to it; nor will substitution of one kind by another, nor the interpretation, in the light of past experience, of a new desire for the things of life which have not been experienced before, will lead to the cessation of greed. Greed will cease instantaneously when you have a clear understanding of its true nature.

19-11-1947

We discussed yesterday the desirability of giving up greed. So long as the mind is after the achievement of a result there is bound to be greed. There is no question of the giving up of greed. When there is clear understanding the greed will cease. A mind that is concerned with explanations and conclusions will not be able to see the truth of a problem. If you begin to enquire into the cause then the mind will be led to the examination of those causes and the present state will

not be understood. Instantaneous transformation will take place only when you realise and face 'what you are'.

21—11—1947

The discussion was mainly about greed, relationship and authority, and was practically the same as in the group-discussion-meeting held in the morning. At this meeting the full significance of relationship and authority was made clear.

24—11—1947

The discussion was mainly about education.

The educator is himself confused and therefore the person taught by him would also be confused. The end always blinds us to the means and it would therefore be necessary to understand first the means adopted for the spread of Education. Understanding of Education is possible only through its results and the means adopted. An analysis was made of the present-day trends in Education and it was stressed that it is no use teaching any one when the educator does not himself know the end-purpose of life

27—11—1947

The subject discussed was one which had been discussed at the Morning Group Meeting but the treatment of the subject was different

It is necessary to understand the true nature of Meditation. As practised by most of us, meditation is an effort to do something of which you have already an outline, thus forcing the mind along a pre-determined channel. Meditation thus becomes a process by which a pre-conceived result is achieved. This process or system involves a routine and a discipline. This, therefore, hampers freedom. Routine makes the mind

mechanical and dull similar to our going to office day in and day out, regularly on time. To discover the truth of Meditation, you have to proceed from yourself and understand the problem. You are all familiar with the effect that routine has on you. It is because most of your life is merely routine, that you are ever in search for relief through going to cinema, losing temper etc.

Again, in following a particular discipline, there is always the implication of authority.

Authority can be imposed either from outside like the Police, the Government etc.; or from inside as in the case of our beliefs or our learning through study, or our past experience. In order to find the Truth of authority we have to follow out the element of authority as it makes its appearance,

(i) by studying the behaviour of persons known to you and who have been following authority. There are the reference books on all kinds of subjects; and if you read them, you will find that the authors who are experts on those subjects, contradict one another. Therefore, after reading all that they have said, you would feel confused.

(ii) by studying yourself under authority. If you analyse your own action you will find that you have followed some authority or other when you have found it profitable to do so. You also have rejected equally good authority when the following of such authority was found to be unprofitable. From this it is clear that you generally get interested in what profits you, and you are not willing to get at the truth of authority. Thus, seeking of profit or craving creates authority.

(iii) by analysing authority. Authority exists outside you in the form of the State with all its various departments, Public Bodies and Institutions to which you belong. Inside you it resides in what you have learned or experienced in the past. In both the cases—outside you as well as inside you—you accept authority only if you find it agreeable to do so; otherwise you reject the authority.

From the analysis of the above three standpoints, you arrive at the truth that craving, or desire for profit, creates authority. You can see the Truth only when you are able to see the false as false. When this is seen you are released forever from the false. Meditation is really the thinking out

of each thought fully and completely so that you see the Truth of that thought.

At this meeting, a distinctive effect was left by every one present in regard to the state of their consciousness. One and a half hours passed away like a few minutes when all the persons present at the meeting followed and completed each thought, without any effort but with awareness. This was real Meditation when "Time" ceased and the "Timeless" came into being.

29—11—1947

We have already discussed about the various factors involved in meditation, and how meditation as generally practised involved belief in gurus, in tradition or in technique.

You follow a technique only when you want to imitate with a view to achieving something. It is only when you know what you want that you can discuss the technique necessary for acquiring the same. If you analyse your thoughts, you will find that you do not really know what you are seeking because at one moment you want something and at another moment another thing. Your mind is a battle-field of various thoughts and desires. Predominantly you feel some pain or some suffering from which you would like to be free. When you seek freedom from such suffering, you find that you are restricted by many bondages. Without knowing the nature of those bondages and how they arose, you merely strive to be free from those bondages, which attempt always proves futile.

It is therefore necessary for you to be aware that you are bound and what you are bound by—i.e., you must understand and be aware of 'what is'. To understand 'what is' you must give your whole being to it. If you feel any effort in this, then it is an indication that your attention is divided between that understanding and some other distraction. In your daily life, almost everything is a distraction—i.e. rituals, cinemas, radios, enjoyment of the senses, etc.—which is mainly due to your thinking in relation to the objects around you. Every thought which is really the result of the past is a distraction. When the mind realises that thinking itself is a dis-

traction, it also realises the futility of thinking. You have only your mind at your disposal and you have been depending only on it for all your understanding; and now you realise that that too is undependable.

1-12-1947

One friend asked whether meditation can be practised for acquiring power, such as clairvoyance, and therefore this subject was taken up for discussion.

Generally speaking, seeking power takes one or the other of the following forms:

(i) Physical:—Power over matter, such as an engine or a motor car. This requires the mastering of the concerned technique. Modern civilization is based on power which man has acquired by scientific skill to tame nature and to utilize its resources for the benefit of man.

(ii) Over yourself:—(a) Body—By doing appropriate physical exercise you gain control over your body.

(b) Emotions: You can control your emotions and also be able to exercise power over others, over your relatives, through relationship. This is how several of you dominate others through relationship.

(c) Mentation. Many of you practice vigorously to exclude various thoughts that arise in your mind in quick succession in the hope that you will be able to have only that thought which you choose. Though the mind will not be creative in this manner, you get some power to arrange your ideas and express them forcefully.

(d) Super-sensory: It is also possible to gain powers of a super-sensory nature, such as clairvoyance. As a matter of fact experiments have been made in America to control matter by thought. Actually, by thought, the second-hand of a watch has been stopped from its movement. This shows that there is the possibility of controlling matter, and probably to some extent other individuals also, by means of thought.

Asceticism is really the pursuit of power through control of various kinds.

Why do you seek power, or domination, over others? Generally this question is approached either (a) through utilitarianism—i.e. what use it may be put to—or (b) humanism—i.e. whether it will help in the salvation of the ignorant, etc. If you follow the utilitarian idea, then you will be lost in the various uses to which power is put and you will not be able to understand the truth of the problem why you seek power. Similarly in following the idea of salvation of others, you bring in the question of morality, right and wrong, etc. Morality implies duality—right and wrong, good and bad, etc. Following this approach you will be lost in the various social and religious edicts that are considered desirable to enforce morality, and you forget all about the search for truth of the problem.

In order to ascertain the truth of the problem you should not be concerned with the uses to which power is put, nor with morality, as such concern always implies conflict of opposites.

You will then find that power is sought for itself because it is gratifying to you. You suggest that power is sought with a view to have continuance of a new desire, to seek fulfilment through things, through relationship and mentation; this indicates that you have attempted to use memory to solve this problem of power because we have previously discussed this question of continuance. As has been stated already, the application of any other idea which we have had before like Communism, Utilitarianism, etc.—to solve our new problem of seeking power—will be a hindrance to the discovery of Truth.

If you have intense desire for the search of Truth and if you realise that your mind is conditioned, then you are free of the conditioning. It is only then that your mind is still and free from all distractions. Then you will realise that your seeking of power is essentially due to your attempt to seek fulfilment of yourself through things, relationship and mentation. You seek such fulfilment because you are empty, lonely and insufficient. When the mind realises this, it is empty of all thoughts and is quite still—i.e., there is no thinking. This is really the highest form of meditation. The mind is then fully alert and is ready for creation to take place. Then the mind will be free from 'Time', duality, etc., with-

out any effort whatsoever. As has already been stated, any system or practice will surely be a hindrance for the mind to arrive at this state.

To sum up, in your search for Truth regarding power, you have realised that conditioning of any kind is a hindrance to discovery of Truth. You have to emphasise not the conditioning but the search. Then, in examining this, you found that the seeking of power is because of your desire for gratification and for filling up your emptiness. Therefore, you must lay the emphasis not on the seeking of power but on understanding the emptiness in you. When the mind thus emphasises the primary issue and not the secondary, and when it follows each thought connected with the primary issue to its conclusion, there is understanding of the problem.

3-12-1947

A friend said that she very much desired to give up something which she felt was undesirable but that she could not do so. She wanted this matter to be discussed. For this purpose, another friend suggested the substitution of the thing which she wanted to give up, by something higher and impersonal. The matter was then discussed.

In daily life there is constant strife in the individual, which wears out his mind. The problem can be enunciated as follows: "I am gossiping: I want not to gossip; but I find it is very difficult." The substitution process will be "I am gossiping; I do not like gossiping; I want to think about something impersonal and bigger—e.g., world problem regarding food".

All religions have advocated the substitution process and also have suggested that the mind be kept fully engaged with these substitutions so that there would be no room for gossiping at all. Seeking God all the time is really having the single substitution, God, which will answer all "evil" qualities.

In seeking substitution, you follow that substitution without knowing what it is, merely because of your past memory or because of your accepting some authority; and the original problem is left untouched. Even when you have substituting, gossiping does not cease, but is repeated probably at a higher and more refined level.

Your whole life is a series of substitutions as can be seen from your ceremonies, your change of religions and religious practices, your change of membership in societies, and your seeking one guru after another, etc. You have to realise that the pursuit of substitution is false.

5—12—1947

You have seen that it is necessary to realise that substitution is a false action. Why do you seek substitution?

You are gossiping and you say that you don't want to gossip and therefore you want to give up gossiping. The desire to give up gossiping is really a substitute for the gossiping which is your actual state.

A friend said that his ill-health was found to be due to smoking and he gave up smoking immediately. It was pointed out that this giving up was really based on the fear of a breakdown in his health and that even though he gave up smoking he had not really solved the problem of smoking.

A habit, however bad it may be, will be continued so long as it is pleasurable and it will be given up the moment it is found to be painful. To be free of habit, you have to understand the problem of habit.

Another friend referred to his having given up pooja recently but that the image which he had been worshipping previously, always stared him in the face. This question was gone into and it was pointed out that pooja was really done by that friend with a profit motive—i.e., with a view to gain something, and that it was based upon authority—i.e., the injunction given by some priest that pooja would lead to his gaining the object in view. His desire for change in regard to the performing of the pooja was also probably due to his having accepted another authority. Thus, there has been no understanding, and therefore the giving up of the pooja has not led him anywhere. When there is desire for gain or profit or to achieve a particular result, there is greed. When there is greed, there is no investigation at all because there is always the fear that enquiry will affect the investment that has already been made. When mind is free of all distractions

like profit and authority, and when you give over your whole being to the understanding of the pooja and all the implications involved in it, then there will be no problem.

8-12-1947

One friend wanted to know how he could solve the various problems that arise in his daily life, and this question was discussed.

In actual life problems are solved by individuals in various ways.

(i) Some people solve their problems one by one as they arise. This process implies that (a) the problems are isolated and are not interrelated, (b) that the individual concerned is asleep and each problem comes and wakes him up—for example, a domestic calamity like the death of a son. When he wakes up, he does something about the problem and then goes to sleep again.

(ii) There are others who find that when they try to solve one problem, that problem is interrelated with many other problems. They get puzzled because of the arduousness of the attempt and, giving up the attempt to solve the problem, go to sleep.

(iii) In the case of others, some problems come to them while they are asleep, and wake them up; there are other problems to which they go when they are awake. In other words, they are half asleep sometimes and less asleep at other times. When such a person attempts to solve the problems, he invariably pigeon-holes them under categories and solves them in the light of what he knows already of each such type or category.

It is, therefore, necessary to understand the truth of this problem.

When you are intelligent, you are fully awake and, in that state, you meet each problem instantaneously and therefore it is not really a problem to you at all. If you are not intelligent or awake, you meet each problem in a half sleepy state and you cannot therefore solve it. This leads to pain and sorrow. When you begin to think about this state, you realise that you are dull and asleep. Therefore in order

to get the correct solution of this problem, you have first to find out why you are sleepy.

The problem now is why are you dull or asleep. Are you dull by nature or have you been made dull by outside agencies? If you believe that dullness is your nature you believe that God has made you dull, as is said by every man of religion. If your dullness is due to outside agencies then you can believe that outside agencies can also make you intelligent—i.e., you can be moulded by environment, by the State. In so doing, you will be believing in materialism. In order to know the truth of the matter, you should not identify yourself with either of these approaches, religion or materialism, but you should understand the true nature of the problem by following out the thought completely.

10-12-1947

On the last occasion, we saw the need to understand the problem without identifying ourselves either with the religious or with the materialistic idea. You have to be free from the conflict of the opposites. In fact, the opposite does not exist at all.

You should not follow the general practice of either identifying with God or with materialism which is based solely on sensate values. In order to see the true significance of both these approaches, you have to start from the known centre, 'I'. You don't know God but you know only the 'me'. You have therefore to start from the 'me' which is really the result of your senses. Thus you have to give the senses their right place. As was stated already, greed creates the conflict of opposites. Mostly due to tradition and to the manner of your upbringing, you think in terms of opposites. There is a continual conflict of opposites inside you—right and wrong, good and evil, anger and non-anger, arrogance and humility, communism and capitalism, materialism and absolutism, etc. This is because you do not know how to view things from the centre, i.e., from the 'me'. Instead of relating every problem to the end-purpose of life, you relate it to one or the other of the opposites, and therefore your life is

full of frustration. If you understand this, you will be free of the conflict of opposites. This can be summed up as follows:—Thesis versus Antithesis—

Communism or Materialism	Absolutism
All sensate values	God, the Absolute Value
Matter and man can be shaped by environment, by the State	Idea moves on matter
Importance of the State	Sacredness of the individual
Totalitarianism	Individualism

The question of duality, the conflict of opposites, has already been gone into fully. As this conflict is wearing you out in your daily life, it is absolutely necessary for you to understand it and thus be free from this conflict.

The naming of a feeling:—When you contact something with any of your senses you give it a name to capture it, usually adopting the convention already set up. This is done even in the case of the feelings that arise in you though the feeling cannot be contacted by the senses. Therefore the word which is 'sensuous', cannot adequately describe the feeling which is non-sensuous. The word is not the thing. However, to you the word has become important and you interpret your feeling through a word. Therefore you miss the full significance of the feeling. As this is one of the things which you are doing constantly in your daily life, it is necessary for each one of you to realise that it is futile to use words which are sensuous to capture your feelings.

12-12-1947

The purpose you have in view in naming a feeling or applying a term to it, is (1) to convey that feeling to others and (2) to place it or to pin it up and to recognize it.

When applied to objective things, the words are quite apart from the things and you don't interpret those things through the words as you can contact those things directly.

In the case of feelings and thoughts, their effect on the body of the person concerned can be seen and felt by others. In order however to convey those feelings to others, the person concerned has to use words to denote them. When a feeling arises, he names it in order to evaluate it according to the frame of references already established in his memory; he thus absorbs it into himself and strengthens the memory, the 'me'. Therefore the naming of a feeling converts it to 'Time'—i.e., continuance—and leads either to the condemnation of a painful feeling or to the identification with a pleasureable feeling. If the feeling is not named, it is not absorbed, therefore it runs its course and then ceases without in any way strengthening the 'me'.

In actual life, we always name the pleasureable feelings thus giving them continuance, and we always avoid painful feelings. A man seeking God by avoiding sensate values is still pursuing sensate values, i.e., pleasure on a higher level—just like a drunkard who seeks pleasure in a crude manner and on a lower level. By avoiding painful feelings and pursuing pleasureable feelings, he works havoc to society and causes a great deal of harm to others. Similarly, the man who seeks pleasure only in ideation, also causes great mischief to others.

You have to understand the implications of this and seriously experiment with yourself by not naming the feelings as they arise in you.

15—12—1947

What is thinking? You realise that it is entirely a new question and your memory does not furnish any framework of reference with which you could answer this question. There is, therefore, hesitancy or silence on the part of the mind. To the challenge involved in the question, what is thinking, there is no ready response from you because the question is absolutely new. There is therefore a gap between the challenge and the corresponding response. What is the state of mind during this gap? In this state, the mind does not refer to any framework of reference but at the same time it is extremely alert though passive. Therefore, intelligence comes into being;

the state of a 'new' mind facing a new challenge can be known by you, though it cannot be verbalised.

17-12-1947

Let us consider the truth or the inner significance of falling in love in relation to the understanding of what thinking is in the light of our previous action.

When you fall in love with a woman, it is a new experience to you. To understand the truth of it you must think rightly. First you realise how all frameworks of references imposed upon you by society (you are old, you are poor, etc.), by your relations and by your friends are all hindrances; when you understand them as such, those hindrances fall away. You are free now. When the frameworks from outside of you fall away, intelligence has begun to operate. You want, however, to be sure that it is whole intelligence and not partial intelligence. When you analyse your state carefully and deeply, you find that your mind dwells upon a past occasion when you saw your love and that your mind also looks forward with the hope of meeting her at a future date—because both of these give sensuous pleasure. All memory, personal experience, gives sensuous pleasure. So you find that while you are in love, there is 'self-forgetfulness' or complete giving over of yourself to another; and also there is a continuity of the self which seeks sensuous pleasure in the past or in the future. This means that self-forgetfulness which implies the giving away even of your life for your love, is in operation with its contradiction namely 'clinging to self'. This state is really an indication of lack of intelligence.

When you think over this, you realise that society in condemning your state is hindering you at every stage in your search for Truth; you are mis-informed and forced to adopt frameworks ever since your childhood, and none can help you to find Truth. You then realise that you are alone and you have to be alone if you seek Truth. In the history of the world every seeker after Truth has found himself alone as explained above. This has been mistaken as a need to run away from the world in order to seek God, Truth.

you would not like others to know or (2) your being uncertain. Thus, fear will cease only when you face 'what is'.

Some say that fear can be got rid of by making an effort or by having the strength or the courage to overcome fear. All effort, will-power, struggle means conflict and conflict cannot lead to the cessation of fear.

Why do you not face 'what is'? It is because of the tendency in you to 'become' the ideal. You don't know 'what is' and yet you don't like it, and you would like to become something else which is your ideal, which is naturally intensifying the conflict and the fear. The ideal does not exist nor is it understood. When you understand this and when you don't pursue this 'becoming', then fear ceases and you face 'what is'.

From this it is clear that your ideas about ideals and methods to achieve your ideals are all wrong and should be thrown overboard. This gives you release from a really great burden.

A friend suggested that he had the fear of death especially because he is getting old and that his son had not yet been employed. This problem was analysed in the light of the point discussed above.

24-12-1947

Whenever you meet with a challenge there is a response. The challenge and the response constitute an experience. Generally each experience leaves a residue—which is what you have learned from that experience; this is memory. When there is a similar challenge again, the response is by the already existing residue. The residue itself is old and it translates the new challenge according to itself and the result is added to the residue. Thus, the residue gets thicker and thicker. Though the accumulation is undergoing modification, it is still old in relation to any new challenge.

You are changing. So also is your neighbour. Yet when you meet your neighbour, you have your old picture of that person.

This residue is a problem only when it is pleasureable or painful. If pleasureable, you leave it as it is; if painful, you do something about it. This is how you have marvellous

recollections of pleasure and horrible recollections of pain. Why do you fight pain or suffering? Is not suffering only a symptom of your avoiding to face 'what is'?

26—12—1947

Suffering is the state of disturbance. Either you try to avoid it through some system or escape, or you understand its true significance.

Whenever there is a problem, it ceases to be so if there is an answer for it. It is really a problem to you, only when it demands a solution and you are unable to find it. It will then be necessary for you to study it for itself.

Craving is the cause of suffering. Without understanding this, your attempt merely to get rid of suffering is bound to be futile.

Supposing you meet with a domestic calamity, like the death of your relative, you feel lonely and you suffer as you would like to retain continuously the state of peace in which you were, prior to his death, and which was agreeable to you.

Is suffering merely a state of disturbance? Is it not a warning that you should wake up and not sleep?

You feel disturbed only when you are asleep or when you hold on to something. Therefore, any attempt on your part to get rid of that disturbance or suffering means that you wish to continue in a state of sleep, and you feel lost because you sought fulfilment of yourself in your relative. You are seeking continuity in a state of sleep to get a permanent security to which you could attach yourself. Therefore this suffering has nothing to do with your relative's death, and you have never treated suffering as an indication to you of your being asleep.

If this is realised by you, then you will be interested only in what you actually are—i.e., in 'what is'—and your desire to get rid of suffering would then be only a distraction.

Because suffering is a disturbance of continuity, you wish to seek ways and means of entrenching yourself in permanency or in continuity, economic, social, etc. You will not be disturbed psychologically either (1) by going insane or (2) by

seeking self-protection through belief and by giving yourself over completely to that belief. As you don't want to be disturbed, you can always find some explanation or other for suffering and you seek a way of not being disturbed psychologically. You then try to shut off everything that disturbs you and to improve in all things that are pleasureable to you. You choose the field agreeable to you and any factor that prevents your choice is a disturbance to you. You therefore adopt a permanent set of choice undisturbed by other things. Naturally you choose the field which gives you satisfaction and you don't want a disturbance in that field except towards improvement. The problem is whether you can improve in the field of your choice without any disturbance, especially when you are trying to shut off the factor that makes for improvement. Improvement can only be known in relationship. Improvement is only by comparison—i.e. by reference to the framework of values, viz., memory which is the residue of experience in relationship with others. This framework is the product of disturbances and you are attempting to use it to ward off disturbance. This attempt, therefore, leads to a perpetual state of contradiction in which there is suffering. In other words, when you attempt to avoid disturbance, you don't want memory; but when you want to improve in the field of your choice, you really want memory; thus there is contradiction. If you don't want any improvement at all but only continue to shut off every disturbance, then it really means 'sleep' equal to 'death'. You feel disturbed because you are sensitive. Therefore when you attempt to cut off anything that causes disturbance to you, it means you want to be 'insensitive', or 'dull'. If there is complete cutting off of disturbances, you will be in a sleepy state. Then, the result of all your further activities in the same direction will be either (1) to put you to sleep or (2) to enable you to realise that cutting-off is a wrong process as it has led you to this state of insensitivity. If there is understanding, there is realisation; and your intention to continue undisturbed changes; you don't then make any attempt to cut yourself off inwardly from anything that was considered to be a disturbance previously; and every such 'disturbance' is no longer suffering because you are now awake and therefore you are able to understand 'what is'.

In daily life, if you watch yourself you will find that you are not sensitive. Why are you not sensitive? Because it hurts you, or because you don't want to be found out in your true colours, your natural instinct is to be physically insensitive. Generally speaking, artists are considered unsteady and immoral. That is because, biologically and physically, they are intense in their emotions.

Modern civilization necessarily involves a biological and physical barrier of insensitivity as otherwise existence will be almost impossible. Is it necessary to have also a psychological barrier? In practice, we are psychologically more sensitive than even physically, though both work upon each other. We have walls of guilt, defence and fear.

Let us find out to whom there is experience, to him who is asleep or to him who is awake. Experience is only to the man who is asleep because he is awakened by that experience and he then says that he has had experience. If he is awake, he is always active and therefore he has no experience.

You now want to know what Karma means. Karma really means either to do or to be, and it comprises (i) the instinctive responses of the physical and (ii) the cultural responses of the psychological human being. The cultural responses are educated, controlled, conditioned and disciplined. Society, by means of its discipline, impinges on the individual and changes his impulses. The individual has also inherited impulses from his past. So, the present is the passage from the past to the future. His cultural and psychological responses are from the past but modified by the conjunction of the past with the present. Thus, the past is controlling and modifying the present—i.e., the cause which was in the past brings about an effect in the present. The past modified by, or flowing through, the present produces action which is also conditioned. The old, meeting the new challenge, produces modified action—i.e., the new is always modified by the old. The past is the 'me' and in conjunction with the present, the 'me', produces action. The past itself was a series of modifications—yesterday was a modification of the day before yesterday in conjunction with yesterday's present; similarly, the day before yesterday was the modification of the day before

in conjunction with the present of the day before yesterday. To-day is a modification of yesterday in conjunction with to-day's present. Thus, the 'modifier' is the continuous entity of the days before yesterday, yesterday and to-day. The modifier is the actor and he is the result of modification of the innumerable days before yesterday. Therefore, he is the creator of time—the time of memory not chronological time. As the actor is the result of the past, he necessarily causes modification to the present when he meets the present which is new. This meeting of the past with the challenge of the present which is new, leads to conflict which results in modification of the new into the old. In other words, your feeling now is conditioned by what you felt yesterday and all the days before. Therefore, in meeting a new challenge to-day, you act in a conditioned manner and therefore you feel pain.

Yesterday was modified by the days before yesterday. In the time-interval, cause and effect form a process of change. That which was the effect yesterday of a cause of day-before-yesterday, is now found to be the cause of the effect to-day; this effect in turn will be the cause of something which will be noticed as effect to-morrow.

Is to-day (which is cause) different from to-morrow (which is effect)? Is cause different from effect? Is what we call modification, a modification at all?

The means creates the end. Is the end distant from the means?

You have seen that what was the effect becomes the cause and what is the cause will become the effect, and that this is a continuous chain throughout. You have also realised that the actor who is the modifier, is also really the cause and the effect, and that there is no time-interval when the cause is distant from the effect; thus cause and effect are the same.

As has already been stated, the conditioned experience of yesterday meets the present which is always new, and modifies the present according to yesterday's conditioning. This modification is taking place continuously with no time-interval and therefore there is no moment in time when the cause and the effect are two distinct things separate and distant from each other. The whole is one continuous process and the action is a continuous stream where the cause, the effect and the modifier are all one and the same.

fore, you would allow all the responses that are already in you to come out ; you do not impede them in any manner. You go on like this, till you have worked out all your old responses. This understanding of responses really leads to the dropping away of your responses and you will be neither 'excited' nor 'not excited', because being aware of every response means intense watchfulness. You will then be in a state of extraordinary pliability when love will come into being. Then, the actor who has realised himself to be the cause, the effect and the modifier, faces everything that comes to him irrespective of whether it is pleasureable or painful without any resistance whatsoever.

31-12-1947

When you do not understand fully "the now" in which you are, how can you know about to-morrow? When you do not know anything about living, how can you understand death? Knowledge gathered from books, or from others or from one's own experience is really an impediment to the understanding of 'what is'. You say that some knowledge of psychology is necessary to understand what we are discussing. Words are useful only so long as they are not hindrances to communication. It is really very difficult to understand how we use words and how to interpret. There is no need to learn any psychological terminology to understand what we have been discussing, especially as we have been using only ordinary words.

Knowledge and book-learning will be a help only in connection with the learning of a technique. For instance, when you study Engineering you begin to know what has been previously experimented with and, as you experiment, you learn more.

Self-knowledge is quite different from technical knowledge. Accumulation of Engineering knowledge and also knowledge about other technical subjects has gone on through centuries and you cannot do without them. But it is not the case with self-knowledge which cannot be communicated to

another. For instance, you suffer not because the book says so; to find a solution for suffering you have to start anew independent of others' experience. You have to start with yourself to enquire and to find out the solution. Any amount of understanding of what others have said about suffering, will not be the same as your own understanding of your suffering or sorrow. Nowadays people go to psycho-analysts in order to dissolve their sorrow. When you gather knowledge in regard to psychology, you are only assimilating the various systems of psycho-analysis relating to the mind. Gathering of such knowledge makes your mind conditioned; and there is also a constant choice and discarding of the knowledge given by others. Mere gathering of knowledge from books really conditions your mind because you search for security in knowledge and you agree with what is pleasant to you; for instance, war is disastrous, every one knows it; and yet, people are ready to go to war. You read a number of knowledge-giving books but you don't relate what you read to your action in daily life.

If you care to analyse the question seriously, you will find definitely that you can understand and face 'what is' without reading a single book. You have got your own prejudice which translates the knowledge that you gather from books; and no book can point out to you that you are prejudiced nor can it teach you how to love. You can only discover when the mind is fresh without any burden of book-knowledge.

Using knowledge to further thinking really amounts to treating knowledge as memory. Thinking is the responses of memory to a challenge. How can understanding which is new be the outcome of memory, of book-knowledge, which is old? The new cannot be the outcome of the old.

To understand to-day, your attachment to yesterday must cease, as yesterday prevents you from experiencing anew.

An incomplete experience leaves a scar or a residue whereas a completed experience does not leave any residue. This residue is memory. Similarly suppression of any feeling leaves a residue. The problem then is how to act without leaving a residue. Psychologically, you have to give an end to every one of your feelings. Otherwise, you carry it over and it becomes a burden. When you see the implications of

continuing the feeling and the truth of ending the feeling so as to leave no residue, there is an immediate ending. Then there will be no continuity but there will be renewal. Memory continuing on and on is incapable of understanding. Therefore a mind seeking continuity can never meet the new. Therefore your mind should not be interested in accumulating; and it can meet the new only when it is not burdened with memory. Similar is the case with your thought and with your feeling.

It is necessary to experiment with this in your daily life and so live that every thought and feeling comes to an end. This means you should be extremely careful as to what you say consciously or unconsciously, what you feel and what you do. Every word has a verbal and a nervous reaction which sets a wave going. Do not allow other's words to react upon you. Be careful not to use words which produce responses in others. Be careful about what books and newspapers you read. Similarly, what you feel affects you nervously and you will find what tremendous effect cinema-going has upon you. Cinema-shows awaken responses which continue in that state and are not ended. Therefore, you are inclined to go again and again to movies. You have to understand this and be free from all these excitements. Love is not memory and it comes into being only before you have a feeling. The ending of feeling is not a battle to overcome a struggle but it is really seeing directly the truth of ending the feeling. A feeling is a thought when named. When words have nervous responses both on yourself and on the individual in relationship with you, they become important; so, you are silent. Similarly, when you end a feeling, there is immediate communion and there is complete understanding.

You should all of you live a personal life of inner awareness which is possible only through love and understanding. You will find Truth only through awareness of your own thoughts, feelings and actions. Such an awareness will free you from your shortcomings and will enable you to solve your problems without your striving to force any solution. Life will then become rich and you will find joy in every one of life's moments, and you will not be interested in any habitual or mechanical pursuits. Then, to you, Reality will come into being.